LB 2846
.B67
Copy 1

SCHOOL PROGRESS

AND

SCHOOL FACTS

ARE YOU INTERESTED IN

- SCHOOL PROBLEMS?
- SCHOOL NEEDS?
- SCHOOL RESULTS?
- SCHOOL FACTS?
- SCHOOL REPORTS AS THEY ARE?

Price, 25 Cents

BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH
261 BROADWAY
July, 1909

CONTENTS

Foreword: PAGE

Trustees, Bureau of Municipal Research 3-7

School Reports As They Are: A Rejoinder:

John L. Tildsley, Principal DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City, answered point for point from official records by Mr. Allen 8-38

School Reports As they Are:

William H. Allen 39-56

Questions Answered by School Reports As They Are:

Bureau of Municipal Research 57-73

SCHOOL PROGRESS

AND

SCHOOL FACTS

ARE YOU INTERESTED IN

- SCHOOL PROBLEMS?
- SCHOOL NEEDS?
- SCHOOL RESULTS?
- SCHOOL FACTS?
- SCHOOL REPORTS AS THEY ARE?

Price, 25 Cents

BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH
261 BROADWAY
July, 1909

LB2846
.B67

Gift
Publisher
[illegible] 1908

FOREWORD

BY THE TRUSTEES

of the

BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH

In the May number of the Educational Review appeared an article by Dr. John L. Tildsley, Principal of the DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City, which contained several misstatements of fact and several ungrounded inferences relative to the Bureau of Municipal Research. The article is entitled "School Reports As They Are; A Rejoinder," and was prompted by an earlier article in the February number of the Educational Review by Mr. William H. Allen, entitled "School Reports As They Are."

As writer of numerous articles on educational topics, and as author of books dealing with educational efficiency, Mr. Allen is competent to make for himself explanations or defences of publications in his name. Therefore, with those portions of Dr. Tildsley's article which refer to Mr. Allen, as writer, the Bureau of Municipal Research does not concern itself farther than to publish for distribution (a) Mr. Allen's original article, (b) an index to facts answered in 72 reports, (c) Dr. Tildsley's article, and (d) Mr. Allen's reply. So far, however, as the purpose and method of the Bureau of Municipal Research have been misrepresented or inadequately represented, the trustees of that Bureau feel it incumbent upon them to modify, correct or deny five propositions in Dr. Tildsley's article:

1. *"The chief aims of the Bureau of Municipal Research are the discovery of facts and the installation of systems of recording facts."* (*p. 435*).

The purposes of the Bureau of Municipal Research are defined in its charter and have been repeatedly published and demonstrated through works as follows:—"To promote efficient and economical municipal government; to promote the adoption of scientific methods of accounting and of reporting the details of municipal business with a view to facilitating publicity in matters pertaining to municipal problems; to collect, to classify, to analyze, to correlate, to interpret and to publish facts as to the administration of municipal government."

2. *"A recent report of the Bureau supports the contention of Dr. Maxwell's report that medical inspection should be transferred to the board of education and that laws should be passed compelling parents to secure medical service for their children."* (*p. 439*).

The report from which this sentence is quoted, "A Bureau of Child Hygiene," was first given out by Health Commissioner Darlington at a joint session of public education associations and the International Congress on Tuberculosis, at Washington, October, 1908. It showed that more law was not necessary for parents of 96% of 1400 children and that the break-down of physical examination was due, not to the fact that it was under the health department, but to administrative weaknesses which were easily corrected in the case of the 1400 children studied, by instruction of mothers and by facilitating treatment of children found to have easily removable defects. Instead of supporting the contentions mentioned in the rejoinder, it proved that substituting efficiency for inefficiency in the department of health had accomplished in three schools the results contemplated by the passage of additional laws and by the transfer of examination to the department of education.

3. *"The Bureau probably made special reports leading to a reduction of $5,500,000 in the board of education budget for 1909."* (*pp. 440, 442, 445*).

The Bureau of Municipal Research made no special reports whatever to the committee that made up the tentative budget allowances for 1909, nor to the board of estimate or the board of aldermen which finally passed those allowances. By invitation of Mayor McClellan and Comptroller Metz, the Bureau's representatives cooperated with the so-called "budget committee" which went over in detail the various departmental estimates and the recommendations of the bureau of municipal investigation and statistics. It made no statements about the school estimates to that committee which it had not printed during the three months preceding in the form of budget notes for the newspapers. Its participation was confined to asking questions which brought out for discussion reasons for or against recommendations made by the bureau of municipal investigation and statistics. The minutes of the sessions will show that when the evidence was before the committee the Bureau's representatives (1) had no responsibility

for effecting any of the reductions mentioned specifically by Dr. Tildsley; (2) suggested that either more facts be obtained to justify the discrepancy in the repair allowances for Queens and The Bronx, or that such discrepancies be eliminated; (3) expressed the belief that the community wanted a progressive policy in vocational training.

When its representatives declared that the community was in favor of more money for kitchens and vocational training, city officials replied that although money had been repeatedly voted for these purposes, the board of education had failed to use the funds for such purposes.

When it declared that the enforcement of the Newsboys' Law and the Compulsory Attendance Law would require a larger increase in the funds for attendance officers, the city officials replied that funds voted the preceding year for increasing the number of attendance officers had been used for other purposes and that the city superintendent of schools had expressed satisfaction with $113,000 rather than $126,000 for attendance officers in 1909.

4. *"Since the Bureau of Municipal Research claims the credit, it must be held responsible for the great injury to the educational system wrought as a result of its activities."* (*p. 441*).

As was shown above, the Bureau of Municipal Research never claimed, never had, credit for reductions. Never in its history has the department of education been given all of the money that it requested. A cut of several million dollars was taken for granted by all officials and taxpayers, months before the budget for 1909 was discussed. With regard to the school budget, as with regard to every other budget, the Bureau of Municipal Research has consistently held that the city has money enough to prevent all injuries which can be proved, and that money should be refused or voted only because of evidence that it is needed or not needed. At the time the reductions referred to by Dr. Tildsley were made, the educational authorities did not prove or attempt to prove the injuries now alleged by the rejoinder.

5. *The Bureau of Municipal Research "has acquired, on the one hand an over-developed critical faculty of a*

rather destructive kind; on the other, it is the prophet of salvation through fact-seeking, fact-collecting and fact-arranging. It is inclined to lay emphasis on system, and not men, on bookkeeping rather than personality; and therefore, Mr. Allen, in the spirit of his institution, has noted slight discrepancies and has enlarged upon them." (p. 448).

Mayor McClellan, Comptroller Metz, Health Commissioner Darlington, the Charter Revision Commission, the Joint Legislative Committee to Investigate New York City's Finances, Governor Hughes, the Chamber of Commerce, the Merchants' Association, not to mention hosts of editorial writers and private citizens, have disagreed with the rejoinder and called attention to the fact that the critical faculty of the Bureau of Municipal Research is never simply destructive, but is notably constructive.

Characterizing the Bureau's method Mayor McClellan's message of Jan. 4, 1909, said: "The service of the Bureau in purely municipal work marks a new departure in city government,—the active cooperation of the public with the city administration." Commissioner of Accounts Mitchel wrote in the *New York World* of Sept. 6, 1908: "The Bureau of Municipal Research may very properly be considered the most important non-official expression of popular concern for the efficient conduct of New York's municipal business."

The Chamber of Commerce has urged all taxpayers of New York to give the Bureau "their strong financial and moral support," because "its work is constructive and is along the line of helpful criticism rather than hostile attack."

Governor Hughes, at the Budget Exhibit, Nov. 2, 1908, said: "The character of the Bureau's investigation to aid administration in this city marks one of the most important improvements of recent years. It is striving to get at the facts in an honorable, straightforward way and is striving to present them so that they will be intelligently comprehended."

Prof. L. S. Rowe, in his book on "Problems of City Government," says:

"The establishment of the Bureau of Municipal Research in New York City marks an epoch in the process of enlightening public opinion. The education of public opinion in municipal af-

fairs, which has been pushed with such vigor during the last few years, must now be systematized and made general throughout the United States. Every community in the country stands in need of agencies such as the Bureau of Municipal Research of New York City, to place the public in full possession of the facts concerning municipal services."

The Bureau is the prophet, not of salvation but of intelligent citizenship, not through fact-seeking, fact-collecting and fact-arranging merely but through fact-understanding of the truth by the general public. If it lays emphasis on system and bookkeeping, it is only because experience has proved that proper system and bookkeeping reveal the truth about the efficiency of men and personality. Without system the ablest men are certain to become victims of unfounded charges.

The *New York Times,* commenting upon the need for adequate school records, recently described the position which the Bureau has been trying to have universally adopted: "The board of education ought to have all the information a factory manager would require to know whether his plant was working efficiently and where improvement was possible."

Far from noting slight discrepancies and enlarging upon them, the Bureau of Municipal Research has founded its public statements upon most exhaustive examination not only of the organization of departments discussed, but also of records running over years, showing results of departmental activity.

In presenting these considerations, the trustees of the Bureau of Municipal Research have had in mind not only the body of students and administrators who may have been misled by Dr. Tildsley's article, but also business men and educators in New York and elsewhere who have received reprints of that article directly from school officials or from New York City's Public Education Association.

(Signed)

Edwin R. A. Seligman, *Chairman*	Richard Watson Gilder
Frank Tucker, *Vice-Chairman*	John B. Pine
R. Fulton Cutting, *Treasurer*	Albert Shaw
	Frank A. Vanderlip

SCHOOL REPORTS AS THEY ARE: A REJOINDER

Socrates considered the Sophists undesirable citizens in that they always sought to make the worse cause appear the better. Is there not grave danger in these days that the fact-hunting reformer, as he runs amuck among the departments of the government of a great city, may make the better cause appear the worse? Is there not ground to fear, as he attempts to show

> **Repeatedly the National Education Association has declared that in reporting school work and school needs any confusion which makes it impossible to discover the inefficient, wasteful and dishonest also covers up honesty, economy and efficiency.**

all departments to be badly managed, all officers inefficient, and many of them dishonest, that the confidence of the people may be so shaken in the possibility of efficient government that two disastrous results will ensue, the first one, that our best men may be unwilling to take office, the second that citizens may seek to contract rather than to expand the activities of our city governments?

Deplorable as it would be for citizens to lose faith in the honesty and efficiency of the management of other city departments, it would be most disastrous should they lose their faith in those who administer our schools, and thus be led to curtail the work of the schools.

> **Nothing could be more deplorable than for educators to mislead the public's faith in the principle of universal education, and either to misrepresent the purposes for which money is being spent, to spend more than is needed on the quantity and quality of education maintained, or to spend millions without attempting to apply efficiency tests to policies and methods.**

The attacks that are being made upon the administration of our schools today can only further the cause of those taxpayers who under the guise of economy seek to cut down to the lowest limits expenditures for education and especially those for teachers' salaries.

> **So far as New York is concerned, taxpayers' bodies have repeatedly gone on record as demanding adequate pay. In**

School Reports as They Are: A Rejoinder, appeared in the *Educational Review* for May, 1909, signed by John L. Tildsley, Principal DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City. To distinguish the rejoinder from my comment upon it, the former is printed in full width, 10 point Roman type; the latter, indented in 8 point black face.

1908, when school officials were requested to explain to taxpayers their estimate, including salary changes, not only did the president and the city superintendent decline to come, but the latter forbade Miss Grace Strachan to come to explain the salary increase bill. Numerous statements on controverted points made by the educational authorities to taxpayers were, as will be shown later, misstatements.

Those of us who have been trying for years to obtain for the teachers of New York City a living wage, and who have finally convinced the Board of Education of the wisdom of securing this for its teachers, are most apprehensive of the unfortunate effects which may arise from the publication of an article in the February issue of this REVIEW which, under the guise of a study of school reports, is largely a malevolent criticism of the management of the public school system of New York City.

No criticism of the management of the public school system in New York City which was ever written by a person outside the school system could do so much to shake public confidence in school management as does this rejoinder, with its inaccuracies, misstatements, evasions, misquotations, and unconvincing apologies. The fact that the writer and his collaborators among school officers and employees wish to help the schools only aggravates the injury done by them in exhibiting publicly, through this rejoinder, so many weaknesses which heretofore were suspected but, for want of records, difficult to prove.

This article, by reason of the position the writer occupies as Secretary of the Bureau of Municipal Research, is sure, if unanswered, to exert a very unfortunate influence not only in New York City but elsewhere.

This article was requested by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, who wished the subject treated "from the standpoint of the Bureau of Municipal Research and its general program for effective publicity."

The same number that included it also had an advertisement of *School Reports and School Efficiency*, with these words: "Its primary purpose is to show how the actual facts of school administration are to be got at, so that the school principal on the one hand, and the taxpayer on the other, can tell exactly how school funds have been expended and how the greatest efficiency in school management is to be secured."

This article, written by Mr. Allen in collaboration with Dr. Elizabeth K. Adams of Smith College, seems to be based largely

My article was based on work done during the summer of 1908, and so stated. Chapter VII was not "an earlier article," but prepared specially for the report of the committee on physical welfare of school children, which appeared under the title School Reports and School Efficiency.

on an earlier article which constitutes Chapter VII of Snedden and Allen's *School reports and school efficiency* entitled "A practical study of one school report" (New York City).

Tho the article deals with the reports of some 62 different cities, the chief emphasis is laid on the reports of the City

72, not 62 different cities. The chief emphasis is not laid on the reports of the city superintendent of New York City, which were used only to illustrate points within my own experience and provable from records at hand.

Superintendent of New York City. Of Dr. Maxwell's Eighth Annual Report for the year ending July 31, 1906, Mr. Allen in his earlier article thus wrote: "A word-to-word reading of this document of 479 pages shows that it deals with questions of tremendous moment not only to New York City but to the educational world. In fact, it is probable that no other single school report touches upon so many problems and so many aims of a public school system. Effective use is repeatedly made of tabular statements to disclose tendencies, to show increases and decreases, to advertise the needs of different districts and different schools for special facilities, to interpret the progress of certain lines of educational effort."

The commended chapter showed by actual citations that "so far as the New York report falls short, it is probably true of it, as of no other, that it is a serious handicap to educational advance throughout the world." It was shown to be defective in technical methods, to waste space in setting up, to lack adequate summary tables. It was shown that totals were not classified; that districts having thousands of part-time pupils also actually had many seats to spare; that district superintendents' reports were not uniform; that by the method used of reporting averages of standing, a class where eight out of ten have a passing mark of 70 might show 100 per cent. of failure; that numerous important questions regarding truancy were not answered; that needs were not shown with regard to roof gardens, gymnasiums, shower baths, proper ventilation, play space, adjustable desks, truant officers; that the cost of vacation schools was not shown; that the published per capita cost was not right; that the reasoning was often illogical and inconsequential, as in the cost of supplies; that the superintendent guessed where he might know the cause of children dropping out of school; that the school census

was relatively futile for want of proper use by school authorities, and that because the census records were buried in the storeroom, another great opportunity was lost to help the cause of education by locating more clearly its problems; that the report regarding physical defects of school children was very deficient; that at a critical time, when the fiscal authorities of the city had become thoroughly interested in the possibility of saving millions in the future by extending health protection over all districts, the official report of the schools came out and did not even suggest that more money was needed for discovering the pupils' need of attention and for insuring such attention; that the report was not written to the general public; and that recommendations were made without giving the public facts to warrant them.

No one can read Mr. Allen's article in the February EDUCATIONAL REVIEW and accept his statements as facts and his conclusions as valid without believing that for some reason Mr. Allen has changed his opinion of the value of the reports of the City Superintendent. Indeed, one can hardly accept Mr. Allen's judgment of these reports as exprest in the last article and believe they are to any extent trustworthy as records of facts and interpreters of experience, for in an opening paragraph he writes, "After living in New York thru five years when schools and public alike have suffered because school problems were discust on theoretical and personal grounds just as if New York were without experience, I have come to believe that there is probably no need today in the educational world so pressing as that for adequate recording and reporting of school experience."

To confirm the conclusion quoted, much has happened recently: misstatements to the board of aldermen regarding playgrounds and vacation schools; confusion about school sites owned by the board of education; conflicting recommendations with regard to school accommodations needed; particularly the failure of a high school principal, the city superintendent of schools and the auditor to quote accurately and to interpret properly official records, which were easily accessible and presumably consulted while the rejoinder was in preparation.

The discovery of facts and the installation of systems of recording facts are the chief aims of the Bureau of Municipal Research.

The want of facts and a bad system of recording facts are the chief charges brought against school reports in

general and those of New York City in particular. A judgment that is the result of years of observation, of conversation with hundreds of teachers, principals, and superintendents, is not, in Mr. Allen's opinion, a fact to be considered in determining educational policy, if we judge him by his condemnation of the City Superintendent of New York for giving as the reason of the failure of certain pupils to complete the high school course, the result of his own experience and that of teachers, rather than tabulated figures.

Observing and talking do not reflect the needs of 600,000 children. "Conversations with hundreds of teachers, principals and superintendents" do not convey the result of school experience. Educators differ on so many points that the only recourse for laymen is definite information, reducible to some common language which means the same everywhere and at all times. Only a small number of principals and teachers participate in "conversations," while all are given an equal hearing by adequate reports.

Mr. Allen's conception of the value of facts is best shown by his table of facts reported by the superintendents of ten cities. Altogether they report 3,048 different facts. The total possibility

From a paragraph written to show nothing else but lack of uniformity. No attempt was made to decide which facts were valuable or not valuable. All facts from each report were recorded.

of fact reporting by the ten cities was thus 30,480; the actual number reported was but 4,149; the ten superintendents failed in their duty of reporting facts to the extent of 27,423 facts. I quote exact figures. Of the total possible different facts, 3,048, the City Superintendent of New York reported 955, an efficiency of 31 per cent. The average of the whole group was but 13.5 per cent., so that the City Superintendent of New York was twice as efficient as the average of the group, but even he fell into the C class, if the completion of facts be the true test of the efficiency of a superintendent. May we not well question Mr. Allen's dictum that the greatest need in education is the reporting of such educational facts? Is not a greater need the presence in our educational system of men of large vision, of keen insight and sound judgment, whose every utterance is a fact to be reckoned with and worthy to form the basis for a new movement and a resulting expenditure of funds?

For over fifty years leading educators have declared emphatically that the "every utterance of men of large vision" is not a safe reliance "to form the basis for a new movement

and resulting expenditure of funds." I can conceive of no doctrine that will do so much to shake the faith of citizens in both the honesty and efficiency of schools as to try to enforce the theory that the unsupported utterance of a superintendent of schools is enough to justify expenditure of funds. Suppose the next superintendent utters the reverse? Who knows what the "utterance" means? What if "every utterance" changes over night, as is often the case where school officials try to get results from an uninformed public?

Through the rejoinder, the superintendent's "every utterance" declares that to carry out his recommendations will cost a mere bagatelle, and infinitely less than $25,000,000, whereas the list on page 14 shows that they represent an immediate outlay of $20,500,000 and a capitalized outlay of almost $200,000,000.

Inasmuch as Mr. Allen lays so much emphasis on facts, and since he criticises school reports, and especially those of New York for the conspicuous absence of facts, it is but fair to Mr. Allen and to the various superintendents criticised, to take up the "facts" of his article and to test them to see if they really give us the truth, which is the aim of his Bureau.

The first facts cited are that the New York report has not an adequate index, that the title does not appear on the back, that the typography could be improved, that the statistical tables could be better arranged, and that some of the sentences are long. Here Mr. Allen scores. Had he gone no farther, he might have achieved a reputation for candor and truthfulness.

Such "facts" as the following, however, cited by the Secretary of the Bureau of Municipal Research, if allowed to stand unchallenged, would seriously lessen the possibilities for usefulness of the City Superintendent of New York and shake the confidence of the public in our whole system of education. "It

Nothing can shake the confidence of the public in our whole system of education so much as knowledge that it is not being given the whole truth with regard to its schools. If to execute twenty-six recommendations will cost $20,500,000, the fact should be boldly stated and candidly defended. If, on the other hand, carrying out these recommendations would cost nearly $200,000,000, either all items should be defended by facts, or some of the recommendations withdrawn. To make recommendations without knowing what they will cost, and then to endeavor to minimize their cost, will everywhere and at all times lessen the possibilities for usefulness of any public official.

Until the rejoinder, there was no reason to know that the superintendent's recommendations had been made with-

out some conception of their cost; I had merely emphasized the absence of supporting facts in his official statement to the public. It now appears that he had not only failed to compute the cost, but that he is so dismayed by my underestimate that he practically says to the public, through this rejoinder, that the recommendations are not of a character to justify so great an expenditure. Sober deliberation will prove that many of them are worth what they need cost.

would cost approximately $25,000,000 to carry out the recommendations made by Superintendent Maxwell of New York

MINIMUM COST OF CARRYING OUT THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY NEW YORK CITY'S SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS IN THE ANNUAL REPORT FOR THE YEAR ENDING JULY 31st, 1907

DR. TILDSLEY'S LIST NUMBER	ITEM	IMMEDIATE OUTLAY	CAPITALIZED OUTLAY
2	Salaries	$ 22,800	$ 427,500
3	Salaries	6,000	150,000
5	Building	1,600,000	11,600,000
	Salaries	240,000	6,000,000
6	Buildings	8,000,000	8,000,000
	Salaries	1,200,000	30,000,000
7	Salaries (Old law)	18,000	450,000
	Salaries (New law)	18,000	450,000
8 (1 to 3)	Building	500,000	500,000
	Salaries	150,000	3,750,000
8 (4 to 5)	Building	1,400,000	1,400,000
	Salaries	320,000	8,000,000
11	Salaries	50,000	1,250,000
13	Supplies	1,000,000	25,000,000
14	Salaries	3,300,000	82,500,000
15	Salaries	280,000	7,000,000
16	Salaries	40,000	1,000,000
17	Buildings	600,000	600,000
	Salaries	60,000	1,500,000
18	Trade school inquiry	20,000	20,000
Omitted by Dr. Tildsley			
19	399 Kindergartners	279,300	7,000,000
20	79 Workshops	57,275	57,275
	Salaries	55,000	1,375,000
21	74 Kitchens	70,000	70,000
	Salaries	52,000	1,300,000
22	Assembly Hall	50,000	50,000
23	Manual Training (?)	25,000	25,000
24	Principal's Home	25,000	25,000
25	Classes for Mental Defectives	12,000	300,000
26	Provision for School Meals at cost	1,000,000	1,000,000
		$20,450,375	$190,799,775

City, beside a radical change in the responsibilities of the health and educational departments. How worth while, therefore, a support from facts that will enlist lay understanding, sympathy, and coöperation; how dangerous, also, recommendations not justified by experience."

It is stated as a "fact" that the carrying out of the recommendations would cost $25,000,000. There is in addition a

> $190,000,000 should have been written. I excluded the teachers' salary increase because on page 132 of the superintendent's report he says that while salaries should be increased, "I understand fully that, owing to financial conditions in this city, there is no immediate possibility of increasing teachers' salaries as I have recommended."
>
> To provide permanently for this $3,300,000 increase $82,500,000 would be required. If the educational authorities had examined their records and analyzed their experience they would have discovered that excluding teachers' salary increases, it would cost, without capitalizing annual cost, a minimum of $20,450,375 to carry out the recommendations listed by the rejoinder, including several that he has omitted.
>
> When a testator makes a bequest of $500 a year to a charitable society, he sets aside $12,500. His interest in that charity costs him not the annual donation, but that donation capitalized. A business man is not willing to add $100 to an employee's salary in December unless able to add $1,200 to the salary during the next twelve months, and unless his business warrants setting aside $30,000 for this purpose, or a capital that will produce $1,200. One reason why school finance has required a Carnegie Foundation and a General Education Board for higher education, and why the United States Commissioner must give a great deal of thought to financial data of public schools, is that school men have not fully realized, or at least have not fully confessed to their constituents, that when they ask for $50,000 a year they ask their communities to make a permanent investment of $1,250,000.

broad insinuation that these recommendations are not based on

> On the contrary, there was a direct appeal for facts to justify and expedite the adoption of such recommendations as facts would support.

facts, not justified by experience. Presumably the recommendations referred to were those of the City Superintendent's Ninth Annual Report for the year ending July 31, 1907, the latest report published at the time of the writing of the article.

The complete recommendations of the City Superintendent for

Omitted by rejoinder: (1) 399 additional kindergartners (pp. 32, 99, 106) requiring for salaries alone $279,300 or a cost of $7,000,000; (2) 79 workshops and 74 kitchens, cost not estimated; (3) assembly hall and manual training plant for Curtis High; (4) home for the principal of parental school; (5) more classes for mental defectives, which require larger salaries for teachers; (6) provision for school meals at cost.

Will the superintendent itemize the cost of these six benefits at less than $10,000,000? That is an underestimate, as results are sure to show.

the year ending July 31, 1907, were as follows:

1. The consolidation of schools whenever possible.

2. An increase in the number of special physical training teachers from 31 to 46.

Superintendent asked for 50 (page 35). 19 additional officers, at $900 the first year, would cost $17,100. The third year these same 19 would be getting $1,200 each, and would cost $22,800. The fifth year they would cost $28,500. Accepting the lowest figure, it would cost $427,500 to make the increase; accepting the highest figure, it would cost $712,500.

3. Increase in the number of special teachers of music and drawing.

For Brooklyn only. Number desired not stated. If same proportion as Manhattan and Bronx, six needed. This would require at least $6,000 the first five years, or $150,000.

4. No new building to be built in Manhattan until congestion in Brooklyn and Queens is removed.

Want of definite information probably accounts for the failure of the board and the superintendent himself to act upon this recommendation. The report for 1908 asks for new buildings in five Manhattan districts. It also says Manhattan's attendance is practically stationary (p. 27) although 2,608 greater than for 1907. Within a few weeks a building has been recommended for district No. 9 to cost, with equipment and site, about $700,000.

5. Four large schools in Long Island City to be built to meet the growth of population due to the opening of the Williamsburg bridge and Pennsylvania Railroad tunnels.

Will the educational authorities state what they proposed to spend for these schools, for sites and buildings, particularly whether they expected to spend less than $1,600,000? If "large" means 1,000 sittings, my estimate is too great; if

"large" means over 2,000, my estimate is conservative. Teachers' salaries for 8,000 pupils would be over $240,000 a year, representing a capital of $6,000,000.

6. New schoolhouses for the forty thousand children between the ages of six and eight not now in school according to the Police Census.

Did the board of education expect to spend less than $10,000,000 on buildings, sites and equipment? At $200 per sitting, the cost would be but $8,000,000; at $30 per child for instruction, the cost would be $1,200,000, a capital outlay of $30,000,000. Of course, many of the children can be provided for without building new schoolhouses; how many, the school report should show. If housing must be provided for 40,000 children distributed throughout the city, it would cost more than $200 per child to provide the proper distribution of grade sittings. Instruction would cost $1,200,000 the first year.

7. To make the Compulsory Education Law to apply to children between six and eight.

Twenty additional truant officers, at the minimum of $900, would cost $18,000, representing $450,000. In three years, these 20 men would be costing $1,200 each, or $24,000, representing $600,000. This does not provide for additional officers to attend to children of three ages added.

8. Recommends

(1) An addition to the Boys' High School.

(2) Completion of Erasmus Hall High School.

(3) Addition to the Girls' High School.

Was it planned to spend less than $500,000 for these three additions? Or less than $150,000, on teachers' salaries? These two represent an immediate outlay of $650,000 and a capital of $4,250,000.

(4) New high school in crowded Ridgewood section.

(5) New high school in Bay Ridge section.

Was it planned to spend less than $1,400,000 for sites and buildings for these two high schools? The last three in Brooklyn cost $2,246,000; one of them $924,290.

9. The high school departments of the Normal College and the City College to be placed under control of the Board of Education.

10. That high school buildings be kept open until five o'clock every afternoon and on Saturday mornings until noon for the assistance of pupils.

How long can pupils be assisted afternoons and Saturday mornings without expense as promised on next page?

11. Summer sessions of high schools for deficient pupils.

Estimated on next page at $50,000 per year, or $1,250,000. When compared with description of what is to be accomplished (page 83 of the superintendent's report) this sum is obviously too small.

12. Permanent tenure for Board of Examiners.

13. A stable income for the Special Fund.

The superintendent surely did not have in mind a special fund tax that would provide for what the board has been given annually, instead of what it has asked for. The difference in these two sums for 1909 is $1,070,529.06. Did the superintendent have in mind a gain of less than $1,000,000 a year? To provide this would require a capital of $25,000,000.

14. Readjustment of teachers' salaries.

Would require a capital investment of over $82,500,000.

15. The foundation of a department of school hygiene.

To make good on the superintendent's outline, pp. 133-143, will cost over $560,000 annually, a capital outlay of $15,000,000. The salary of a nurse is $900 of a physician, $1,200. If cost of supervision, of clerical work, of supplies and incidentals be included, the foregoing estimate is low. In the table this item is given at $280,000.

16. Certain amendments to the compulsory education law.

Three years to the compulsory school age and sixty days to the compulsory school year, and to compel parents to provide for proper mental and physical needs of their children.

These include, *(a)* adding three years to the compulsory school age, and *(b)* 60 days to the compulsory school year, and *(c)* laws to compel parents to provide for proper mental and physical needs of their children. On the next page, the rejoinder says this "would simply add the cost of enforcing the law"—'simply' meaning capital outlay of from $1,000,000 to $2,000,000, a minimum annual expenditure of $40,000.

17. Erection of one-story buildings for blind and crippled children, as in Chicago and London.

Five, page 154. Had the superintendent in mind to spend less than $1,500,000 on the erection and equipment of these buildings, the purchase of sites, the conduct of classes? If he will put in black and white what he purposes to spend, this will, I believe, be found a conservative estimate.

18. The formation of a committee to study trade schools.

The rejoinder estimates $1,000 which is only another way of saying that the inquiry is not worth while. Evidently, when it comes to travelling and inquiries, our educators can make a dollar go farther than in the management of local schools.

The superintendent asks (page 146) "that as many members of your supervising force as may be necessary be sent to Europe and to different parts of this country to make a thorough study of trade schools."

19. Deficient teachers to be excused with pay for fifteen afternoons to take special work in training schools, as in Chicago.

How many deficients are there? Is it proposed to have this work done without cost by existing teachers? Will teachers be paid for their extra service? How long will there be no cost? Will no substitutes be required while different teachers are away?

These are the recommendations which Mr. Allen says will cost $25,000,000 to carry into execution. He offers no figures in proof of this astounding statement. He evidently expects the

The burden of proof is never on the citizen who asks a question, but on the official proponent of the recommendations. Writing for a magazine is slightly different from writing an annual report to give an account of one's method of spending other people's money and supporting one's recommendations for further expenditure. The foregoing figures show that my statement was too low. It has brought into the open our educational authorities, with the misfortune, however, that a principal of a high school, instead of the superintendent of schools or an officer of the board, signs his name to the attempt to minimize the cost of carrying out the superintendent's recommendations. By circulating the rejoinder, however, the school authorities endorse that attempt.

My moderation is astounding and reprehensible, not my estimate of $25,000,000. Astounding too is the fact that the rejoinder could have been published and circulated without our educational authorities, discovering that the minimum immediate outlay, counting only the first year's additional salaries, is $21,000,000; the more probable figure is $25,000,000; while the continued execution of the recommendations would require a capital outlay of almost $200,000,000.

reader to accept these figures on the authority of the Secretary of the Bureau of Municipal Research, an unofficial and irresponsible body, but criticises the responsible head of the great public school system for expecting people to adopt any one of his plans if he does not present statistical proofs for every statement he makes. "How worth while a support from facts!" Of these twenty recommendations Numbers 1, 4, 9, would actually save money. Numbers 10, 12, 13, 19 would entail no extra expense.

See preceding remarks after each item.

Numbers 2, 3, 5, 6, 8 call for expenditures which arise from the ordinary growth of the system and are practically of a routine

This is begging the question. I said recommendations, not increase for new and unheard of experiments. Whether building of schools should be discontinued in Manhattan, whether four large schools or four small schools should be erected in Long Island City, whether new school houses are needed to take care of children not in school, are questions of fact that taxpayers have a right to ask proof of before spending $10,000,000 and setting aside $36,000,000.

character. Number 7, the modification of the compulsory school law, entails no new kind of expenditure, but merely the resulting increase of the old. Number 11 would cost approximately $50,-

Even this underestimate means not $50,000 only but $50,000 annually or $1,250,000. Numbers 7 and 16, as shown on page 12, mean simply $76,000 annually, or $1,900,000.

000. Number 16 would simply add the cost of enforcing the law. Number 18 would cost less than $1,000. There are left, there-

See statement, preceding page.

fore, of new projects costing money:

These three mean a capital outlay of $90,000,000 and a continuing annual cost of about $4,000,000. If all other recommendations refer to routine which must happen anyway, why does the report treat them as recommendations instead of forecasts?

Nowhere did my article mention "new projects costing money." On the contrary, in tabulating 375 recommendations, I said, "Some gravely indict present methods and equipment; all presume experience as their basis; all involve the expenditure of energy, and, with one or two exceptions, expenditure of money."

(1) The increase of certain teachers' salaries at a cost of $3,300,000, a project which had been discust by the Board of Education for two years and in support of which Superintendent Maxwell gives facts and figures covering ten printed pages, of which more later.

(2) The plan for one-story buildings for blind and cripples based on the experience of Chicago and London.

(3) The formation of a department of hygiene and the transfer of medical inspection from the Department of Health to the Board of Education, a project discust in two annual reports and supported by facts and figures occupying ten pages of the report.

As shown later, the project was not properly supported by either facts or figures.

Where are Mr. Allen's facts to substantiate his $25,000,000 estimate, and where the justification for his inference that the City Superintendent's recommendations were not based on facts of experience?

Where was the fact instinct of our school authorities, that they did not look before they asked this question?

Mr. Allen further makes the charge in his article that the report of Superintendent Maxwell gives no facts to prove the necessity of transferring medical inspection to the Board of

This demand was based on no authoritative record. My article reads, "Although New York had furnished inspiration to other cities through magazines and press articles, the school report shows not a statement of fact, not a table of work done." The next report for 1908 contains tables of work done, (pp. 138-139). Similar information might have been presented in the report under discussion.

Education, or for passing a law compelling parents to secure medical service for their children, yet on page 109 of the 1906

My article referred only to the 1907 report. The rejoinder misquotes and misrepresents the irrelevant 1906 report.

report, the statement is made that in one school out of 150 cases of adenoid growth in the throat the parents of over seventy of these afflicted children would do nothing to procure their relief,

Superintendent's qualification of the foregoing, p. 110: "True, they gave their consent to have the necessary operations performed in school by a prominent surgeon attached to a large hospital, who kindly volunteered for the work."

There was no mobbing of these physicians. On the contrary, the operations were followed by an ice cream party.

and later on physicians of the Board of Health who proposed to relieve the children were mobbed by these parents. On page 442

The mobbing was of other schools, at another time, by other parents. At least one riot was stopped by a wise principal who thought of singing instead of throwing mud at the health department.

of the same report it is shown that during the year 1906 but 78,401 pupils out of a total register of 559,000 were examined by the physicians of the health departments; that not a single pupil in the high schools was examined, while in the report for

High schools are not mentioned. It should be remembered that although the schools had physical directors and the physical contact with needy children, the department of health, to its credit, took the initiative in calling the atten-

tion of educators to physical needs that a proper system of reporting would have disclosed many years before.

The school authorities could at any time in four years have made a serviceable eye test for all pupils. There, as in the teaching and practice of hygiene, the gap between their knowing and their doing is greater than the efficiency gap of the health department referred to by the rejoinder.

1907, page 141, it is stated that in only 248 schools were any inspections made and that but one-third of the pupils in these

Instead of one-third, less than one-fifth of the children were examined that year.

schools were examined. In addition to the ten pages contributed by Dr. Maxwell on this subject, Dr. Gulick in the report of the Director of Physical Training, Appendix J of the Report of the City Superintendent, offers some five pages of reasons, based on his own experience and that of his teachers, why a special department of hygiene should be established.

A line to line reading of the trifle over three pages (421-424) of Dr. Gulick's discussion of this subject shows that he does not have in mind the department of school hygiene desired by the superintendent. Far from making an argument for transferring the work of the department of health to the department of education, Dr. Gulick asks for one medical officer and says on page 424, "I do not contemplate the assigning of this officer to duties that are now being performed by the department of health."

During an eleven years' experience in the high schools of this city, in three different high schools, the writer has known of but one occasion where a physician of the health department was in the building, and that was for the purpose of vaccination.

A recent report of the Bureau of Municipal Research supports the contention of Dr. Maxwell's report: "Examining the same children one inspector (of the Board of Health) found that thirteen children were suffering from pulmonary disease, another inspector found only two; one inspector found twenty-eight children suffering from malnutrition, another only ten."

The report referred to is "A Bureau of Child Hygiene: Co-operative Studies and Experiments by the Department of Health of the City of New York and the Bureau of Municipal Research." 41 pp. plus illustrations and inserts. On p. 26 it says, "The obstacles to removing physical defects are not primarily those of unwillingness of parents." As my article stated, "the parents of 96 per cent. of 1400 children in 3 different districts of New York City promised to act promptly when told the reason for acting." The department of health at once reorganized its school work and established a bureau

of child hygiene, with a program bound to succeed if school officials co-operate and publish results. At the time the rejoinder was written about 60 per cent. of the children examined this school year and found to have defects had received treatment. Instead of mentioning this fact, the rejoinder harks back to 1906, when the work was still experimental, and when the school authorities were talking of free school meals rather than of removing physical defects and educating parents.

The criticism is further made in the article that New York gives but part of her per capita cost of education. This is not a criticism but a quibble. The reason why the per capita cost is not mathematically accurate is that it does not pay to estimate and charge to the different activities the exact share of running expenses that should fall to each activity, as the superintendent's salary, the janitor's salary, the cost of lighting and heating where the building is used jointly by day and evening schools, for recreation centers and for examinations, public lectures, etc. Such criticism is hardly worthy of a scientific observer who claims to be desirous of improving school reports.

Many other cities find it worth while and easy to publish the right per capita. The U. S. Commissioner of Education and the U. S. Census Bureau consider that it pays to charge to different activities their share of running expenses, and this year are ascertaining for all cities of 30,000 and over what different school activities cost. The per capita published in the superintendent's report and used by him at public hearings injures the cause of education by under-stating the cost of high schools and many other features, by overstating the cost of elementary schools, and by misrepresenting the relative cost of City College, Normal College, and high schools.

On page 119 of this article we learn that "New York's Charter Revision Commission has not thought it strange or inefficient to have recommended changes in the school charter without reading school reports." The inference is that this is due to the

This sentence followed the statement "questions of local policy and taxation are seldom settled (in any part of the United States) with reference to facts presented in school reports."

futility of the report. The facts are that the Charter Revision Committee proposes to recommend sweeping changes in the educational features of the charter, not only without reading the report of the City Superintendent but also without attempting to get the point of view of the seventeen thousand teachers and

supervisors concerned. Because of their belief in the general

The commission may not have attempted wisely because it could not get uncolored, impersonal evidence; but it did at least attempt to get the point of view of teachers and supervisors and all facts which they possessed.

The rejoinder's assertions and implications regarding the Charter Revision Commission (not 'Committee') show the extreme difficulty of discussing any school question in New York City impersonally and with reference only to facts.

principle of local self-government, without regard to the merits of this particular case, in the face of the almost unanimous opposition of the teaching force of the city, they have recommended the abolition of the State protection of salaries, a system which, in the judgment of all competent observers, has given to New York City a class of teachers far superior to that which she had under the local control of salary system. And this vital change is being pushed thru by the Charter Revision Committee without a hearing, with little knowledge of the facts and with the evident approval of the writer of the article. A reading of the last report of the City Superintendent, in which this matter was fully discust, might have saved them from this unwise step.

The question of State protection is not "fully discussed." The report, p. 114, does say, "It put an end to an almost intolerable position with regard to teachers' salaries. * * * I sincerely trust that it will be maintained on the statute book as a defence against capricious changes in teachers' salaries until something better is provided."

In the same paragraph we are told "How reports, when used, may influence local policy is illustrated in New York whose fiscal officers have recently, *without discredit to themselves,* cut the educational budget from $33,000,000 to $27,500,000, because special reports to the budget committee showed" certain irregularities which will be discust later in this article.

The special reports referred to were probably those made by the Bureau of Municipal Research which thus, thru its secretary, claims the credit for the $5,500,000 reduction made "without discredit to the officials." Since the Bureau of Municipal Re-

Please see statement by the Bureau's trustees.

search claims the credit it must be held responsible for the great injury to the educational system wrought as a result of its activity. The article further states that "when given a chance at the taxpayers' hearing to defend their estimates, school

officers were without data to justify their protests." It is hard

Instead I should have written "school officers were silent." I did not want to imply that officials of the board of education, possessing evidence that injury was about to be done the schools, would sit silent.

to realize that the Secretary of the Bureau of Municipal Research does not know that this statement is not true. At the taxpayers' hearing no attack on the educational budget was made, hence there was no occasion to make any public defense. What

At the hearing on the tentative budget, the above reduction was announced in cold type. For several hours the board of estimate listened to different city officials protest against reductions in their budget estimates. The only occasion for a public defence was that the mayor asked if they had anything to say. No attack from outside would have been permitted, because the citizens' hearing was closed. So flagrant was their failure that the *Globe* publicly criticised them for not having taken advantage of this opportunity. Effort was made to bring secret influence to bear upon fiscal officers, even though the occasion did not justify public explanation.

are the facts? Of the $5,500,000 asked for and not granted, $3,300,000 was for a special increase of the salaries of certain

This figure was $3,273,000, and includes salary increases for numerous extensions of service not granted.

large classes of teachers. For two years, this matter of the inadequate salaries paid to certain classes of teachers had engaged public attention, columns had been written about it in the newspapers, it had even occupied weeks of the time of the State

Weeks of agitation publicly condemned by the superintendent of schools and by the board of education, and by the writer of the rejoinder. The facts used in this agitation are still in controversy.

Legislature, and the veto of the Governor alone had prevented a large increase for certain of these teachers. The City Superintendent had devoted twenty pages of his 1907 report to this sub-

These twenty pages were devoted, not to the proposition before the board of estimate last fall, but against the proposition of equal pay for equal work. In the pages that are relevant to a proper salary schedule (130-132) he nowhere mentions the figure $3,300,000. On page 132 he says the city's finances do not permit an immediate increase.

ject. A special committee of the Board of Education had after long deliberations twice recommended these increases amounting to $3,300,000 to the Board of Education and the Board of Education had in turn twice asked the Board of Estimate for the money. Every member of the Board of Estimate had received

from the various associations of teachers interested complete statements of the reasons making necessary the increase asked for, and in addition to this in September of both years represen-

For 1908 this was $3,129,000, again including salary increases for a number of extensions of service not granted.

tatives of these associations had made representations in person to the members of the Board of Estimate, and the special committee of the Board of Education on the readjustment of teachers' salaries had consulted the members of the Board of Estimate.

The superintendent criticised the Davis Law (p. 114) because "drawn up by a legislative committee after conference only with representatives of different teachers' organizations, and without reference to an harmonious underlying scheme or plan." Far from approving this salary schedule, more than half the teachers actively opposed it, which fact was well known to all schoolmen. The facts necessary to a proper determination of teachers' salaries are still in controversy, and only recently Mayor McClellan appointed a committee consisting of Joseph H. Choate, Prof. J. B. Clark and William C. Brown, president of the New York Central, to get facts!

It is generally conceded that had the panic of 1907 not come just when it did, the Board of Estimate would have granted the $3,300,000 asked for and the teachers would now be enjoying the increased salary. In October, 1908, the Board of

No, not "generally conceded." This is some inside information which, of course, taxpayers ought to have possessed in 1907, and authority for which statement it is fair now to ask of the educational authorities. The figure should be $3,128,567, again including salary increases for extensions of service.

Education a second time asked for $3,300,000 for the increase of teachers' salaries, but the continuance of the bad times and the fear of too greatly increasing the tax rate caused the second

And because its principle was strongly opposed by more than half the teachers, and the public left in the dark as to the facts.

refusal of the amount asked for. Tho the total budget was increased from $143,000,000 to $154,000,000, the teachers, as usual,

What possible excuse is there for saying $143,000,000 instead of $143,572,000, and $154,000,000 instead of $156,545,000? If "nearest millions" almost explains the first, how about the $2,545,000 shortage in the second? Not until we have adequate accounting and reporting will the public know whether all school business is conducted with such inaccuracy as characterizes this rejoinder, on which several of the school system's highest priced employees and officers collaborated.

were the ones to suffer the cut. Whether the refusal of these increases was a credit or discredit to the Board of Estimate is a matter of opinion, but the cutting out of this item was not due, as Mr. Allen states, to the failure of the Board of Education to present properly the reasons for the increase in its budget. The Auditor of the Board of Education had prepared a printed budget of 458 pages, showing how every dollar was to be spent.

> **This statement shows where, not how, every dollar is to be spent. It asks for so many things that the board of education does not expect to get and does not want, that a mere appearance of an item in this budget can hardly be said "to present properly the reasons for the increase in its budget."**

The $3,300,000 was applied for on the ground that with the present salaries enough capable teachers could not be obtained

> **Throughout this paragraph the rejoinder confuses "enough" with "capable" and "enough capable." Refusing the grant of $3,300,000 had no effect whatever upon the number of teachers who could be engaged. That large sum was requested to increase the salaries of existing teachers, plus amounts necessary to increase salaries for certain teachers not allowed. The results here enumerated relate chiefly to the number, rather than to the quality of teachers. Increasing the salaries of the present teaching force of the DeWitt Clinton High School will not release any funds for engaging regular teachers instead of substitutes. Increasing the salaries of 10,000 present teachers will not release funds to correct "a scarcity of teachers." The board of education has had repeated opportunities through reports and public hearings to state clearly and convincingly to taxpayers what injuries, if any, are being suffered by pupils because of insufficient salaries for teachers, or because of insufficient number of teachers. The most recent statement from educational authorities is that of the rejoinder.**

to carry on the work of the schools properly. As a consequence of the refusal of the Board of Estimate to grant this amount, there is today a scarcity of teachers and the pupils suffer thereby. The present appropriation is not large enough to enable the Board of Education to fill vacancies as they arise. The schools are forced, therefore, to rely on substitutes; for example, one-fifth of the teaching force of the De Witt Clinton High School is made up of substitutes; in an annex to another high school with ten teachers the only regular teacher is the teacher in charge, and this same scarcity prevails in nearly every other high school. Will Mr. Allen still claim for the Bureau of Municipal Research the credit for this condition?

We have given the real facts as to $3,300,000 of the $5,500,000 cut out of the budget of the Board of Education. What are the facts as to the remaining $2,200,000 denied the Board of Education "without discredit to the Board of Estimate" as a result of the activities of this same Bureau? Of the $5,500,000 applied for but not granted, $4,490,218.79 was to be a portion of the general fund for the paying of teachers' salaries, and the remainder was a part of the special fund for other purposes than teachers' salaries. Inasmuch as Mr. Allen confines his attack to the general fund with which the City Superintendent is more immediately concerned, hence possibly the reason for the attack, we shall take up the deficiency in the general fund.

Of the eight times specified on page 120, where the board of education budget had misstated the facts, four referred to the special fund, and not to the general fund. All placed responsibility squarely upon the board of education. The city superintendent is not mentioned.

Deducting $3,273,163.52, the amount needed for salary increases, from the $4,490,218.79 of the general fund, there remains $1,217,055.27 cut off by the Board of Estimate "without discredit to itself," therefore by reasonable inference unnecessarily applied for by the Board of Education.

However necessarily applied for, these items should have been supported by such facts that they could not have been cut out, if such facts existed.

The chief deductions were:

(1) $168,340 to fill vacancies in the elementary schools.

On May 31, 1908, when estimates were made for the budget of 1908-9 there were vacancies in elementary schools calling for a salary fund of $168,340 for the year. This item was asked for and not granted.

(2) $385,210.49 needed for additional elementary teachers. The normal yearly increase in the necessary activities of the Board of Education, owing to the continuous increase in population, is about 5 per cent. This therefore naturally entails an

For the last four years ending June, 1908, the average increase in register—all schools—has been less than 4 per cent., having been 4 3-10 per cent. in 1907-8 and 4 1-10 per cent. in 1906-7; in average attendance much less than 4 per cent.; in net enrollment 3.63 per cent. Impossible to learn for elementary schools only. But it would be smaller than for all schools, because much smaller than for high schools (7.45) and kindergartens (11.06).

approach to 5 per cent. increase in the amount required for the

teachers' salaries, somewhat less than 5 per cent., since the new teachers will receive less than the average salary of those already in the system.

The rejoinder fails to compute what this difference is. The result would go far to explain the two reductions last mentioned.

Allowing the 5 per cent. increase in the fund for 1907-8 of $15,629,168, we have $781,458. The Board applied for $762,460 and received but $377,249.51, an amount less than was needed by $385,210.49. Adding this to the amount needed to fill vacancies, we have $553,550.49, which Mr. Allen probably regards as saved to the City of New York since the schools are running without the necessary increase in the number of teachers. This is the usual mistake of the man who is not familiar with the actual operation of schools. We save, he thinks, only when we obtain results with less expenditure. The

Equal results with less expenditure—yes.

cutting off of this $553,550.49 from the salary fund of the elementary schools means (1) larger classes, 60 or more, and over-

42, not 60, on average register, a trifle over 30 per teacher on average attendance, according to the report for the year ending July 31st, 1908. To report just where classes of 60 exist is an easy way of securing more funds.

crowded and worn-out teachers; (2) the use of inexperienced substitutes instead of regular teachers. The pupils get poorer teaching in either case. Is this saving the city money?

(3) $105,694 saved in the salaries of high school teachers. The amount asked for the general fund for high schools was $2,398,951. The Board of Estimate granted $2,293,256.99, a deficiency of $105,694. The amount asked for was based on the normal increase in registration which from 1906-7 to 1907-8 was from 22,931 to 25,264, or 10.2 per cent., whereas the increase in the registration of February, 1909, over February, 1908, is from 28,209 to 34,363, an increase of 22 per cent. The high schools are suffering from a double difficulty as the result of these reports to the Board of Estimate: First, the failure to raise salaries has cut off the supply of candidates for positions in the high

Cut down from what to what?

schools; secondly, the scaling down of the estimate to the amount of $105,000 has made it impossible to secure the additional teachers needed for the increased registration of pupils. The result is again, as in the elementary schools, too large classes,

If these assertions can be proved and traced to budget cuts, it will be desirable but new information to New York City. The average number of pupils to teachers in high schools, based on average register, is 23; based on average attendance, 20. If, indeed, elementary schools have classes of 60, is there not perhaps a trifle margin of increase in high school pupils per teacher without serious injury to education?

too many teaching periods, the use of untrained substitutes, sometimes no teacher for days at a time, with the resulting loss to the pupil. If the force of teachers in the De Witt Clinton High School be cut down one-half, we could still keep the school open, but we should not be teaching the boys.

Fourthly, $149,000 decrease in the fund for special teachers. The Board of Education asked $679,913 for teachers of special branches; they received $530,915, a deficiency of $149,000; another saving, but at whose expense?

At present there are but thirty-one teachers of physical training for the forty-six school districts,—that is one to 452 teachers. The Board asked for one to each district, 46 in all. Even then

The estimate for 1909 (pp. 62-63) asks not for 46 but for 20 women teachers of physical training and 9 men, a total of 29. If failure to grant the additional appropriations means that "work is languishing and gymnasiums are not used as they should be," that fact is not brought out in the report of the city superintendent of schools for last year, dated December 31st, 1908, more than two full months after the allowance for physical training teachers was announced. The summary of recommendations does not mention this need (pp. 162-163); nor is this condition divulged on pages 431 to 439, signed September 30th, 1908, by Dr. Gulick.

each special teacher of physical training would still be responsible for the physical training of 305 classes. The result of the failure to grant the additional appropriation is that the work is languishing and gymnasiums are not used as they should be. In like manner additional teachers of shop work and cooking who were asked for were cut off, and several shops and kitchens which were erected during the year are lying idle for want of teachers.

Additional special teachers in drawing are needed in Brooklyn and Queens, where the area of the districts is large and where there are many small schools lying far apart, and where as a consequence a large part of the time of the teachers is spent

in going from school to school. The cutting out of $149,000 has made it impossible to remedy these conditions.

If we put together the conditions that the rejoinder says resulted from a reduction of this $149,000, we are astounded at the service which this amount would have bought. No one could gather from the superintendent's report for 1908, dated December 31st, 1908, two full months after these budget reductions, that conditions were as serious as they are here reported by a high school principal. Among the summary of recommendations (p. 162) no mention is made of these conditions. Under the heading "Need of More Kindergartens, Workshops and Kitchens," (p. 103 ff.) these conditions are not mentioned. On June 15th, 1909, the board had a balance of $180,233.25 in its trust funds available to correct such conditions.

(5) An appropriation of $4,920 was asked for a school for the blind; it was refused. The blind are as yet untaught. Is this a credit to the Board of Estimate?

The rejoinder is careful to say "as yet untaught" rather than "as yet unprovided for." At the time of writing the board of education had appropriated $5,000 for the blind. Where did it get this money? The *Globe* said next day "from other appropriations."

(6) $16,950 was asked for three day schools for truants, to be organized on the model of the disciplinary school in P. S. 120, which has proved so successful. The money was refused, and the chronic cases of truancy and incorrigible conduct are still wasting the time of the teachers, the principals, and the boys themselves in the elementary schools.

Writing December 31st, 1908, no mention of this condition is made by the city superintendent. Nothing is said about it in recommendations. The rejoinder's statement would have been very opportune at the taxpayers' hearings.

(7) The allowance for evening schools was decreased $43,000. This means of course fewer schools this year.

$40,590, not $43,000. (Estimate p. 83; Budget, p. 60.) Fewer schools this year than might have been, not fewer schools than last year. The evening high appropriation increased $13,400. The evening elementary, $7,300.

(8) Lastly we come to the question of vacation schools, recreation centers, playgrounds, and baths. The Board of Education asked for $441,752. It received $175,000, which was $40,000 less

So far as anybody could tell from the board of education budget, there was no serious plan to spend this total. There

was no expectation of getting it. The budget professed to have actually organized for 1909 activities costing over $240,000. At that time they had actually organized on a supposed basis of $215,000.

than the amount actually spent last year. The Committee of the Board of Education having charge of these activities thought it wise to treble its work and had planned with these additional funds, if granted, to open every playground in the afternoon and the shops and kitchens every afternoon and every Saturday morning. The additional amount asked was large, but the benefit to be gained was very great in keeping tens of thousands of children off the streets and engaged in healthful and profitable pursuits. If the city is too poor to do this, then the failure of the Board of Estimate to grant the funds asked was without discredit to them, but on no other supposition.

These activities are potentially too valuable to be based upon misinformation or lack of information.

School officials raised a hue and cry about an alleged reduction of $40,000, whereupon numerous newspaper editorials were written under the impression that there was a curtailment of $40,000. The superintendent's report for 1908 repeats the error, as did the board of education, in asking for special revenue bonds in March and June, 1909. Trust funds have been available this year as last for these purposes throughout the agitation based on misstatements of fact. With the intention of using these trust funds, vacation schools, etc., were organized beyond the budget allowance.

It received $184,504 or $496 less than it had last year, and $28,162 less than it actually spent last year. (Budget, p. 60, $175,000; p. 58, $9,504.) Far from trebling its work, it wanted to add 10 to its 27 vacation schools, 6 to its 95 vacation playgrounds, 6 to its 28 evening recreation centers. Far from wanting to open every playground in the afternoon, it asked for money to open 49. The budget does not explain, says nothing about shops and kitchens every afternoon and every Saturday morning, and says nothing about the number of children who would be benefited.

For five years attempts have been made to stampede the public of New York to secure funds for recreation centers on the plea that vacation schools keep children off the streets, and give them profitable pursuits. Assuming that official statements from the department of education were made in good faith, a group of social workers appeared before the board of estimate and apportionment to request funds for vacation schools. Dr. E. T. Devine had charge of the hearing. When asked by Comptroller Grout what assurance could be given that if additional money was voted

for vacation schools it would be used for vacation schools, Dr. Devine quoted a letter written by the then president of the board of education, Henry N. Tifft, pledging use for the purpose named. The money was procured, but was not used for the purpose named, although from that same general fund money was found that year for salary increases not mentioned at budget time.

It has been shown how it was possible for the Board of Estimate to reduce the budget of the Board of Education by the sum of $4,411,365, and what the consequences have been and are to be in work not done. Does the discredit lie with the body of trustees of the public good who saw the need and asked for the funds? Or with the body which refused the funds? Or with the body—the Bureau of Municipal Research—which, Mr. Allen insinuates, made the representations that led to the refusal?

Mr. Allen further attempts to discredit the Board of Education by charging:

(1) "That year after year the Board of Education in its estimates had been overstating by hundreds of thousands of dollars the amount needed for additional teachers."

On May 22d, I asked the superintendent of schools if, in stating the cost of engaging the additional teachers necessary for the additional registration, the board of education estimated the "saving that would result from the retirement of higher priced teachers who, according to experience, might be expected to leave the system during 1909," and if the board of education in its estimate for the year 1908 gave this expected reduction. No answer to date.

An impartial investigation of the budgets laid before the Board of Estimate and Apportionment would show that this statement is untrue. The fact that all the money asked was not granted is no proof to the contrary. On the other hand, the fact that at no time since 1902 has the Board of Education been able, because of lack of funds, to fill vacancies in high schools, elementary schools, and kindergartens, as they arise—that the vacancies made and the new classes organized between December and September of each year are filled for the most part by substitutes until the first of October or November—and the further fact that the Board has in some thousands of cases been unable to divide classes of abnormally large register, while each year the appropriation is exhausted—are proof positive that the appropriations have been insufficient and that the demands of the Board of Education have not been exorbitant.

The appropriations might be insufficient and the aggregate demands of the board not exorbitant, and it still be true that the board of education overstated the amount required for teachers to take care of additional registration.

(2) "That funds had been diverted contrary to written and verbal pledges." In making this charge Mr. Allen does not state that the Board of Education of New York City is a corporate body of trustees; that it has no legal or moral right to bind itself as to the disposition of its general fund, nor has any other body the right to make such a demand upon it; that its one duty is to use the general fund intrusted to it for the best interests of the schools of New York City, meeting each need as it arises as best it may with the funds at its command. If therefore in its judgment it seems wise to transfer $30,000 to the fund for vacation schools, it is not only its right but its duty so to do. It and it alone is responsible to the people for the conduct of the schools.

If the necessity be conceded, it does not follow that the board of education should have broken its pledges rather than go to the board of estimate, as do other departments, requesting authorization to depart from those pledges.

It is very difficult to meet on common ground educators who thus flagrantly proclaim that a pledge made by a board of education is not binding upon it. President Winthrop said, in the autumn of 1907, that he did consider a pledge made by him and his finance committee as binding. The board of estimate voted for teachers' salaries last year $570,000 more than the three mill tax, and the year before voted $652,000 more. No one would seriously question its right to impose the conditions upon which it shall vote an excess over the compulsory tax. (In May, 1909, the board of education denied that it transferred $30,000 from other parts of the general fund to the vacation school fund).

(3) "That of $18,000 given for additional attendance officers, only $600 was used for that purpose." This was simply an exercise of the Board's rightful discretion,—it lacked sufficient funds to pay the teachers' salaries. It was forced to take $50,000 from the High School Bonus Fund and the Training School Trust Fund. To further make up the deficiency still remaining, it availed itself of the $17,400, inasmuch as the City Superintendent had nominated only five new truant officers late in the year, in view of the lack of funds for salaries of teachers already employed.

The board of education did not avail itself of $17,400, nor is it true that at the time he refused to nominate additional truant officers, the superintendent did so because of a

"lack of funds for salaries of teachers already employed." We have already seen that $28,000 was transferred for recreation centers, etc. What reasons were actually given cannot be proved until the original minutes are made public.

So determined was the apologist to make out a case that he did not even ascertain how much was spent for truant officers. So he innocently subtracts $600 mentioned by me (the case August, 1908, while the budget was being discussed). Evidently his informants forgot that it costs something to pay for "only five new truant officers late in the year."

(4) "That $7,000 given to increase particular clerical salaries had been distributed among a larger number late in the year so as to effect an annual salary increase of $20,000." Mr. Allen in his investigations of the city departments must have discovered that every one of these salary increases, after being adopted by resolution of the Board of Education, had then to be approved later by the Civil Service Commission, the Controller, the Board of Aldermen, and the Board of Estimate before the increase could be added to the pay-roll, and that any evasion or subterfuge was impossible.

Not one of the increases referred to followed that course. It is difficult to understand how responsible educators could have made such a statement.

(5) "That money was asked for the rent of a building not used since 1907."

The amount involved was $600 in a budget of $33,000,000, and was due to a mistake of a clerk in adding to the list of leases in Richmond one that had expired. Is that a good reason for diminishing a budget by five and one-half millions?

Is it not reason enough for wondering whether the board of education takes steps to know whether information submitted to it by its subordinates is correct or incorrect, and whether the budget contains a number of other plausible items for spending which the board of education has no plan?

The budget receives less official attention than did this rejoinder which abounds in errors that certainly discredit the educational authorities more than could any statement by an "outsider."

(6) "That it was costing from three to five times as much per pupil or per room for repairs of furniture and pianos, as well as of buildings, in the Bronx and Queens as in Brooklyn and Manhattan." This difference in cost is simply an illustration of the importance of taking the right basis of comparison between schools and boroughs. The number of pupils or number of

rooms is not the proper basis for repairs but the relative condition of the buildings in the various boroughs. In the Bronx, but more notably in Queens, there are a large number of small old

> **Every time they have been asked to explain this discrepancy, the educational authorities point out small old buildings, or small wooden buildings. President Winthrop gave this explanation last year to the Greater New York Taxpayers' Conference, which assured him that it wished to support all justifiable requests. That is the only reason that has ever been assigned publicly. To test this plausible reason, the Bureau of Municipal Research has analyzed the repair cost for buildings erected since 1900 and classified as brick-stone in the board of education's report for the years 1906 and 1907:**

	Average Sittings Two Years	No. Schools	Per Sitting: Ordinary	Per Sitting: Furniture	Repair Cost: Pianos	Repair Cost: Total Six Items
Manhattan	36,260	15	$.77	$.256	$.008	$1.65
Brooklyn	48,388	29	.73	.095	.06	1.16
The Bronx	17,399	11	.88	.144	.005	1.65
Queens	5,576	6	3.33	.359	.006	5.41

buildings used for a scattered population. The pianos and furniture in these buildings are also old. This condition comes down

> **Again, so determined to defend his superiors was the apologist that no analysis was made for pianos and furniture. Therefore a plausible defence, although the facts show that I was wrong in stating that pianos cost from 3 to 5 times as much per pupil and per room. My article was written before other facts were available than the President's admission of a discrepancy due to "small old wooden buildings." Dr. Tildsley had access to records for 3 full years.**

from the days prior to the consolidation into Greater New York when the small towns and villages of Queens County did not provide so substantially for the schools as did the more densely populated cities of New York and Brooklyn. Naturally a high school in New York of fire-proof construction but three years old and registering 2,200 pupils, needs a far less expenditure for repairs per capita than four high schools in Queens housed in old buildings originally used for grammar schools and which combined have the same registry as the one Manhattan school.

> **Comparing the small, old Stuyvesant High School in Manhattan, brick-stone, built in 1865, with the Bryant High, brick-stone, built in Queens 1902-05, the per sitting repair costs are reported by the board of education as follows:**

	Ordinary	Furniture	Pianos	Total Six Items
Stuyvesant (small—old)	$4.70	$0.47	$0.70	$7.95
Bryant (new—larger)	8.34	1.17	.03	11.95

If the Secretary of the Board of Municipal Research had been longer in New York and familiar with the condition of its schools, he would not make the mistake of indicting the Board of Education because of a different per capita cost of repairs in different boroughs.

The indictment against the board of education is not because of a different per capita cost of repairs in different boroughs, but because of an unexplained difference, a misrepresented difference, and a policy that permits subordinates to misstate the truth or to make sweeping statements without first undertaking to learn what the truth is.

So much may be said in answering the criticisms of the New York reports. We do not believe that Mr. Allen realized the impression that would be made by his article upon the readers of the EDUCATIONAL REVIEW. It is not thinkable that Mr. Allen deliberately misstated facts. The explanation probably lies in

Is the same true of educators who prepared the rejoinder, and whose own records refute them as citations show?

the temperament of Mr. Allen and the exigencies of his present position. The Bureau of Municipal Research has acquired on the one hand an over-developed critical faculty of a rather destructive kind, on the other it is the prophet of salvation thru fact seeking, fact collecting, and fact arranging. It is inclined

Please see introduction by the Bureau's trustees.

to lay the emphasis on system rather than men, on bookkeeping rather than personality, and therefore Mr. Allen in the spirit of his institution has noted slight discrepancies, has enlarged upon them, has expected his own system of making reports to be followed, and hence has given us this most pessimistic article on school reports.

It is not thinkable that Mr. Allen's methods will ever be substituted for straightforward reports in New York or any other city. Were there any educational system whose policy should be determined by substituting mere figures for the wisdom of experience, by forming destructive inductions from isolated facts, and by accepting half truths, more mischievous than lies, for whole truths, in such a system Mr. William H. Allen's system of reporting would be highly appropriate.

JOHN L. TILDSLEY

DE WITT CLINTON HIGH SCHOOL

NEW YORK

Will the writer of the rejoinder inform the public if the city superintendent of schools, or the president of the board of education, or the auditor, or any committee chairman saw his article before submission to the *Educational Review?* Is he willing to publish their names? Is he willing to publish the names of school officials who either gave to him or helped him obtain his data? Will school officials send this reply to those who received reprints of his article from school officials?

CONCLUSION

The New York schools can not, if they will, prevent progress in school reporting. Other cities now have information which we are not able to obtain. Our own taxpayers know that there is a way of obtaining information. The facts given above prove that the writer of the article and any superior officers who may have collaborated in its preparation, have not given us the benefit of "the wisdom of experience" or have not been averse to "half truths, more mischievous than lies."

The time is not far distant when New York's system of reporting school results will be modern and efficient. Then the methods of statesmanship, instead of those of the politician and of agitation will be employed, by subordinates wishing advancement, by the city superintendent of schools or by the board of education itself wishing funds for justifiable purposes.

Nothing could more clearly establish the truth of every proposition in my article than the first recommendation in the superintendent's report for 1908, issued just about the time that this rejoinder was written, namely, that "an assistant trained in making statistical investigations should be appointed on the staff of the city superintendent's office." From this recommendation it is but a step to a demand for records that currently tell the truth clearly and with a saving of teachers' and principals' time. Facts that should be currently reported by school authorities are now being sought by the Russell Sage Foundation at great expense. There is no better way of befriending the school system of New York City than to demand efficient methods for recording school experience, and for separating competent from incompetent, practicable from impracticable, wasteful from economical.

Reprinted from the EDUCATIONAL REVIEW, New York, February, 1909.
Copyright, 1909, by EDUCATIONAL REVIEW PUBLISHING CO.

I

SCHOOL REPORTS AS THEY ARE[1]

The personality tablets and the educational experience that may be discovered in school reports, even as they are, offer a splendid field for some progressive magazine wishing to give the whole country the benefit of pioneer work and pioneer thought by makers of school reports. Whether complete or incomplete, perfunctory or earnest, with or without illuminating matter, the formal statements of school superintendents to their communities constitute our richest mine of educational data—the fragmentary materials of research with which scientific study of school problems must begin. They tell much more of the elasticity, open-mindedness, and instinct of workmanship among educational leaders than could *Who's who,* or a gallery of portraits,—far more, too, of the obstacles and opportunities that confront those leaders than do treatises on adolescence, or histories of education.

To discover what school reports really are is a task far more interesting than the subject implies. In June the EDUCATIONAL REVIEW asked me to prepare two articles on *School reports as they are,* and *School reports as they ought to be,* "from the standpoint of the Bureau of Municipal Research, and its general program for effective publicity." Dr. Elizabeth Kemper Adams, whose courses in education at Smith College include field study of educational administration, became so interested in the contemplated examination that she gave to it her summer vacation, thus making possible

[1]Written in collaboration with Dr. Elizabeth K. Adams, Smith College.

a more detailed analysis than would otherwise have been possible.[2] Two graduate students, Miss Beavers of Adelphi and Miss Allen of Columbia, have since assisted. School reports are full of two essential ingredients of sensation and inspiration,—opportunities seized and opportunities lost. After living in New York thru five years when schools and public alike have suffered because school problems were discust on theoretical and personal grounds, just as if New York were without experience, I have come to believe that there is probably no need today in the educational world so pressing as that for adequate recording and reporting of school experience.

Desire to better school reports is general, for eighty-six replies were received from cities and forty from states, in response to an invitation for suggestion and criticism sent to the superintendents of the hundred cities having the largest population, and to all state superintendents. The present article, and a second,—*School reports as leading educators would have them,*—are based upon these answers, and upon an analysis of seventy-two city reports.[3]

For exhibits of best things and of weaknesses in school reports, for a story of repeated efforts by the National Education Association to improve reports, for a list of questions never answered and occasionally answered, and a study

[2] Each report was read from cover to cover, all statements of fact, all recommendations, and the essential elements of make-up being listed. Financial items were not scheduled because the Teachers College studies have already made clear the deficiencies in this particular, and the United States Commissioner of Education is now gathering information that will lay the basis for future complete and uniform financial data. The number of items tabulated (3,500) was so great that it has not seemed desirable to detail them, especially as their lesson can be fairly shown by tables for ten large cities: New York, Cleveland, St. Louis, Buffalo, Boston, Baltimore, Pittsburg, Chicago, Cincinnati, and Philadelphia. The last-named city is not fairly represented, because the superintendent sent us his own report without the tabular matter on which it is based.

[3] Much that is here said of city reports is not true of state reports, which have made greater progress in securing both uniformity and completeness. Because the accuracy of uniform and elaborate tables may still be questioned, and because the attainment of ideals for state reports depends upon improvement in reports for cities where educational problems are most acute, the question of state reporting, except for purposes of illustration, is left for future treatment.

in detail of the New York report, the reader is referred to *School reports and school efficiency*. I want here to consider certain aspects of reporting that especially concern the parent, taxpayer, press, and outside student of school questions.

The cost of printing school reports gives an idea of the educational results we are entitled to expect and to require. The following table shows that the present cost bears no fixt relation to population or school enrollment:

City	*Population*	*Copies Published*	*Cost*
New York	3,437,000	3,000	$1,750
St. Louis	575,000	2,000	1,600
Baltimore	509,000	500	260
Buffalo	352,000	3,000	1,000
St. Paul	163,000	1,500	2,000
Rochester	163,000	2,000	500
Kansas City, Mo	164,000	2,000	1,095
Providence	176,000	1,500	325
Lowell	95,000	10,000	420
Albany	94,000	1,000	205
Jersey City	206,000	2,000	800
Louisville	205,000	1,200	300
Lynn, Mass.	69,000	3,000	1,000
Seattle	81,000	1,000	88
Columbus	126,000	1,000	600
Worcester	118,000	1,500	132
Duluth	53,000	1,000	600
Elizabeth, N. J.	53,000	000	000
Pittsburgh	322,000	1,500	299
Los Angeles	102,000	2,000	350
Houston	45,000	1,500	500
Covington, Ky.	43,000	200	160
Manchester, N. H.	57,050	500	65
Birmingham	38,000	3,000	1,000

To produce the sixty-two city reports for which facts were received cost $25,000, the annual income on $600,000. To print twenty-six state reports cost $47,500. Including the value of labor given to compilation, preparation, proof-reading, editing, our annual school reports, state and city, represent the income on an investment of probably $5,000,000, or more.

The number of reports published has a bearing upon the effectiveness, make-up, and audience. Indianapolis has had no report since 1902. Elizabeth and Des Moines hope to print reports next year. St. Louis prints 2,000, but has a mailing

list of only 400. Lowell, with a population of 95,000, prints as many copies as New York, Philadelphia, and Boston, with a combined population of over 5,000,000. Birmingham, with 38,000 population, prints and distributes 3,000, more than Baltimore, New Orleans, New Haven, Paterson, Richmond, and Trenton combined, with an aggregate population of 1,200-000. Cambridge, the home of fair Harvard, and Minneapolis, likewise a center of learning, together mail 1,600 copies, for a combined population of 300,000. New Haven, beneficiary of Yale's atmosphere for two centuries, prints only 500. What does it mean that in New York the Board of Education, spending from $30,000,000 to $40,000,000 a year, has declined on grounds of economy to print enough reports, or even abstracts for all teachers, and, including its out-of-town mailing list, prints but 3,000 copies?

The make-up of reports proves the need for better technique in editing, typesetting, binding, etc. Of seventy-two superintendents, only eighteen give an index; only eighteen employ black face type for emphasis or clearness, while only nine have even those unsatisfactory tables of contents by pages which discourage reference. Seven print the name and date on the back of the report, a very important little thing when a library shelf contains more than one report. Indentation, summaries, percentages, diagrams, are so seldom and so sparingly used that one wonders whether authors had in mind their use by either students or a public wishing light on school problems. New York City's report of 663 pages has a table of contents with no cross-references and with no subdivisions whatever of 500-odd pages written by associate superintendents. Contrast with this one letter of Cleveland's alphabetical index:

Improving school conditions 44
Increased effectiveness of the Teachers' Institute 47
Increased salaries for teachers in elementary schools 44
Increased defective schools 59
Indigent books, 14; new policy determined, 22; restriction of privilege, 22; results 23
Industrial education, extending, 50; credit course in applied arts established, 53; evening trade schools, 52; high school manual

training course revised, 54; revision and extension of elementary manual training work, 52; The Technical High school 51
Industrial education, see also Technical High school.
Inspiration of education conventions 50
Instruction, cost of 50
Interest, coupons for 165

Altho nearly thirty years ago the National Education Association requested that all reports begin with summaries, few, as yet, have such summaries, and those given are not uniform, are incomplete, and often confusing. What might be put into a summary will be discust in the next article. Suffice it to say that, generally speaking, it would be possible to tell five times as much in one-half the space now used in city reports. For example, New York City uses a page of over six inches to set forth the following facts:

License Sought	*No. Applications*	*No. Granted*	*No. Refused*
Ungraded class licenses	37	9	28
Substitute licenses	1,741	1,585	156
Licenses to teach in vacation schools, etc.	3,108	2,538	570
Licenses to teach in evening schools	4,881	3,513	1,368
Totals	9,767	7,645	2,122

After setting up a special total for each of these items, the New York report reads thus: "The total number of persons examined for the various grades and kinds of licenses designated by the Board of Education on the recommendation of the Board of Superintendents was 13,494. The total number of licenses was 10,086. The total number of applicants who failed was 3,408." Two such tables, not condensed, are among four tables properly condensed. Much space is taken for long sentences to the effect that "the following table will show," etc., etc., or "the above table shows," etc., etc.

Few reports show any definite plan: many being a jumble of fact, school history, educational discussions, etc. A pleasing contrast is the report of Cincinnati's superintendent, who explains the scope and plan of his reports, and logically develops it.

How far are defects of make-up and the small number of copies issued due to indefiniteness of the audience which superintendents are conscious of addressing? Fifty-two cities report that budgets are not publicly discust. Of 1,000 recommendations made in seventy-two reports, few seem to have been addrest to the people who pay the bills for carrying them out. Dissimilarity in language and method of reporting implies that other superintendents are not the audience. Lack of technique and of apparent interest in presentation suggests that trustees are not invariably aimed at. Altho sixty cities send reports to teachers, few impart information to, or invite suggestions from, the teaching staff. Superintendents seldom try to justify themselves to themselves, for few reports are accounts of stewardship: efficiency of system, officers, teachers, supervising staff, or of teaching and business methods is not shown; in fact, the *not-done,* the *not-yet-done,* the *partial failure* are rarely mentioned. Here and there are evidences that information is intended for general consumption. Erie, Pa., keeps available for ready reference all newspaper accounts bearing upon the conduct of the public schools. Milwaukee's superintendent urges more publicity of school matters, "to work up interest in schools and to get the best professional personnel on the board." Utica advises the greatest publicity of board expenditures.

Failure to picture the superintendents' audience is indicated by the small number of illustrations. This can not be due to lack of funds, for "before and after" pictures of adenoid children, such as Cleveland gives, may save several pages of discussion, exhortation, and description, and many thousands of dollars for visits by nurses and truant officers and for teaching needlessly backward children. An obdurate trustee will not argue against a photograph of an unadjustable desk that causes spinal curvature because it does not fit its occupant, or of gas jets burning in the daytime. Either the forty cities printing illustrations are extravagant, or other superintendents are profligate in failing to use the wealth of live material furnished by school incidents, children's activities, products of laboratory, workshop, and playground. If illus-

trations did not convince, enlighten, and entertain, makers of newspapers, magazines, and textbooks would save enough yearly to endow a national institute for the promotion of efficiency in public schools.

Of 375 recommendations made in the reports of the first ten cities, the subject distribution was as follows:

School property and equipment	84	Vacation schools	8
Modifications of curriculum	43	Promotion and school mortality	7
Schools or classes for defectives	24	School gardens	6
Professional progress of teachers	23	Text-book problems	5
Industrial education	19	Kindergartens	5
Medical supervision, examination, etc.	19	Methods of receiving and spending funds	5
Teachers' salaries	18	School aid to needy children	2
Truants or delinquents	14	More accurate census	1
School laws and board rules	14	Moral training	1
Closer correlation between parts of system	13	Free lectures	1
Classes for the "out of grade"	10	Physical education	1
Schools as social centers	9	Economy in supplies	1
		More visiting of schools by board	1
		Size and make-up of board	1
		Miscellaneous	40

If the foregoing recommendations were to be adopted at one time, or if they were to be debated at one time, what commotion would result! Some gravely indict present methods and equipment; all presume experience as their basis; all involve the expenditure of energy, and, with one or two exceptions, expenditure of money. It would cost approximately $25,000,000 to carry out the recommendations made by Superintendent Maxwell of New York City, besides a radical change in the responsibilities of the health and educational departments. How worth while, therefore, a support from facts that will enlist lay understanding, sympathy, and coöperation; how dangerous, also, recommendations not justified by experience.

If recommendations were based upon definite information and discust with reference to such information, it would not be necessary to wait twenty-five or fifty years to grasp or reject the blessings tendered by these superintendents: school boards of five with an executive business agent and proper

accounting methods; no more waste of supplies; annual school census; use of dwelling houses for overflow registration; purchase of sites, and construction of buildings according to a comprehensive plan, in anticipation of city growth; sanitary buildings only; heliostats and trained janitors; dressing-rooms, dispensaries, physical examination rooms and instruments, lunchrooms, kitchens, baths, exhibition rooms, photographic darkrooms, domestic science rooms, attendance offices for issuing work certificates, sanitary drinking fountains, telephones to save the attendance officers' time, ample schoolyards, athletic fields, playgrounds, and apparatus. All districts would have school gardens, vacation schools, night schools, and buildings opened for neighborhood clubs and entertainments. Every school would have its parents' association and coöperative relations with labor unions, public libraries, relief agencies, chambers of commerce and manufactures. Teachers would receive equal pay for equal work; would not draw pay when absent; would be compelled to take courses for their advancement; would be periodically tested, and, if found inefficient, would be either dropt or pensioned. All children would be protected from contagious and removable defects; nurses would explain defects to parents; laws would compel operation or better nourishment when necessary. Special schools or special classes would be started for the deaf, crippled, blind, paralytic; while the backward would be studied and advanced. Foreigners would be taught civics; girls, domestic science; boys and girls would be given industrial and commercial training; and the curriculum for elementary schools and high schools would be absolutely made over. Police courts would attend to truant cases with interest in the child's education. Greater attention would be given to school hygiene and moral instruction. Principals and teachers would be alert to recognize physical defects, and would hold frequent conferences so that upper and lower grades, elementary and higher schools, would work for a single plan; the curriculum would fit for life as well as college; physiological, not chronological, age would determine the promotion to secondary schools. School mortality and promotion would be studied, the elementary course shortened, and the shorter day recognized as the normal day

for younger pupils. Promotion would be by subject and whenever the child is ready, and not when his fellows are ready, or when a majority of subjects are past.

From the seventy-two reports analyzed 3,500 facts were scheduled, not including the financial items. Had each report contained all items, there would have been a total of 252,000; in fact, there were only 13,234. Not a single item appeared under the same name in all reports, nor did one appear in all of the reports for the first ten cities. The following table gives for these cities a consolidated statement showing for nine different subjects the total facts reported by all cities, the number by each city and its proportion of total possibilities —assuming similar treatment.

LACK OF UNIFORMITY AND COMPLETENESS IN CITY REPORTS

Consolidated Statement of Number of Facts Reported by Ten Cities

Ten Large Cities	Population and Attendance	Promotion and School Mortality	Truancy	Medical Inspection	Special School for Defectives	Miscellaneous Matters in School Reports	Volunteer Aid of Public Education	School Plant and Equipment	Organization and Staff	Total
Total separate facts...	1,664	324	505	100	124	67	46	158	60	3,048
New York	383	157	260	23	11	16	18	63	24	955
Cleveland	133	2	82	31	25	8	6	61	19	367
St. Louis	476	21	45	0	26	22	2	49	15	656
Philadelphia ..	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	20	0	31
Buffalo	374	58	82	0	0	9	2	34	20	579
Boston.....	176	32	1	39	12	25	0	26	23	334
Baltimore.....	211	18	11	2	4	9	2	44	21	322
Pittsburgh....	69	4	0	0	0	8	7	13	13	114
Chicago	192	32	50	1	53	6	5	28	19	386
Cincinnati	169	55	39	33	27	16	11	32	23	405
Totals Checked	2,192	380	570	129	159	119	53	370	177	4,149
Total Possibilities	16,640	3,240	5,050	1,000	1,240	670	460	1,580	600	30,480
Totals Checked Omitting Philadelphia	2,183	379	570	129	158	119	53	350	177	4,118
Total Possibilities Omitting Philadelphia....	14,976	2,907	4,545	900	1,116	603	414	1,422	540	27,423

Reports as they are disappoint educators. In 1908, as in 1868, when the National Education Association began to deplore their poverty of helpfulness, school reports cover different periods, are not complete, use dissimilar language, and are not uniform, city with city, district with district, nor school with school within a city. Two attendance officers working side by side in Minneapolis or Utica answer different questions. Per capita in Chicago includes all costs. Many cities give no per capita. New York's per capita includes only part of the cost, and furnishes occasion every year for a squabble between the Normal College president, the City College president, and the city superintendent of schools about three per capitas made up of different elements. Superintendent Snyder, of Jersey City, writes: "All who have anything to do with comparison and school statistics appreciate the danger of mistake in making these comparisons, because items that have the same names in different cities have so many different meanings." In spite of progress made in state reports, Superintendent Morrison of New Hampshire writes: "I am convinced that not a few otherwise scholarly studies have been made and results published which are almost wholly vitiated by lack of uniformity. . . . Average attendance means one thing in Massachusetts and another thing in other parts of the country." Professor David S. Snedden declares in *School reports and school efficiency,* that "the majority of reports illustrate a striking phase of inefficiency in American municipal government," because they "fail conspicuously to provide statistical information either to the layman or to the administrator." Commissioner Brown of the United States Bureau of Education, said of that appeal for adequate reports: "I am very glad that this book has been written and published, and am convinced that we are to find ways by which the public school statistics in this country may be made more directly serviceable in the improvement of the schools."

School reports as they are serve neither critics nor defenders of present tendencies in popular education. A well-known writer, who "went honestly to condemn" the public

schools, and "came back to explain and praise," says: "Nor is there a more misrepresented and misunderstood subject in America than this question of public schools." Yet he tries to shatter misrepresentation without reference to any school report, trusting to the small number of school facts which he is able to see with his own eyes. President Eliot condemns large school boards, but does not seek proof in school reports. Superintendent Morris of Covington, Ky., laments "the dense ignorance of the average boy of the present day when he leaves school and applies for work;" neither he nor others furnish proof nor disproof. Theories come and go, experiments are made, curriculums are changed, but seldom is a school report quoted to justify an opinion or an innovation.

Public officials do not use school reports. Mayors, governors, and presidents love to address meetings of educators; yet, judging from their executive treatment of school budgets, and their tardy recognition of school problems, they have drawn little knowledge or inspiration from school reports. Can you imagine a national conference at the White House to consider the conservation of our educational resources?

Teachers do not look to school reports for help. Where, outside of Teachers College, Columbia University, is there, in the United States, a school for teachers that undertakes to train the educators of the future to prepare adequate and clear statements of school experience, or even to read school reports? In some instances, judging from workmanship and content, it is doubtful if the authors themselves have critically examined their products.

Questions of local policy and taxation are seldom settled with reference to facts presented in school reports. New York's Charter Revision Commission has not thought it strange or inefficient to have recommended changes in the school charter without reading school reports. Not only is it not expected of New York school trustees that they themselves read the reports addrest to them, but a leading paper recently said that a new trustee was eminently fitted to tell what the schools need, "because he went thru the public

school himself." How reports, when used, may influence local policy is illustrated in New York, whose fiscal officers have recently, without discredit to themselves, cut the educational budget from $33,000,000 to $27,500,000 because special reports to the budget committee showed: that year after year the Board of Education, in its estimates, had been overstating by hundreds of thousands of dollars the amount needed for additional teachers; that funds had been diverted contrary to written and verbal pledges; that money given for elementary schools had been used for other purposes; that of $18,000 given for additional attendance officers, only $600 was used for that purpose; that $7,000 given to increase particular clerical salaries had been distributed among a larger number late in the year so as to effect an annual salary increase of $20,000; that money was asked for rent of a building in 1909 which had not been used since 1907; that money given for school kitchens, etc., had been used for other purposes; that it was costing from three to five times as much per pupil or per room for repairs of furniture and pianos, as well as of buildings, in the Bronx and Queens as in Brooklyn and Manhattan. When given a chance at the taxpayers' hearing to defend their estimates, school officers were without data to justify a protest. The only demurrer entered was by a volunteer body, ineffective because both uninformed and misinformed.

Medical supervision, examination, inspection are discust by forty reports. By 1907 the physical welfare of school children was of national interest. Grave questions of state policy are here involved: State socialism, public health, school curriculum, physical education, school hygiene, school morals, school budget. Yet little can be learned from the regular reports of ten cities with an enrollment of 1,500,000, and a probable 900,000 needing attention to eyes, teeth, breathing, nourishment, etc. In 1905 Superintendent Maxwell had proposed at St. Louis the giving of free meals, and had protested against forcing free instruction upon children whose undernourished bodies made them unable to profit from such instruction. Robert Hunter's *Poverty,* John Spargo's *Bitter*

cry of the children, Chicago's Bureau of Child Study, and the Massachusetts state medical inspection law had stimulated press comment. The New York Committee on Physical Welfare of School Children had completed its first year of research and educational work. Altho New York had furnished inspiration to other cities thru magazines and press articles, the school report shows not a statement of fact, not a table of work done. Boston reports 39 of 100 facts given in ten reports, but omits the number of schools where examinations were made, the number of children examined, excluded, needing treatment, treated, cured. Chicago and Baltimore mention medical inspection, but do not report their experience. The New York report charges the health department with inefficiency in the examination of school children for physical defects, and declares that medical supervision will never work successfully until taken from the department of health and lodged in the department of education. Legislation is recommended to punish parents who fail to attend to defective children. Altho the department of health had a complete record of children examined and found defective, the school superintendent gives no facts; altho tests had proved that parents would act if shown why children's school work was hindered by physical defects, these tests were not quoted. Obviously, it makes all the difference in the world to the success of medical supervision whether the state must send a nurse or a police summons to homes. The Bureau of Municipal Research found that parents of 96 per cent. of 1,400 children in three different districts of New York City promised to act promptly when told the reason for acting, while 81 per cent. did act at once; and the health department, alleged to be incorrigible, when confronted with evidence of its inefficiency, established a bureau of child hygiene with a program bound to succeed if school officials coöperate and publish results.

Failure to win promotion and school mortality are worrying educators. To remedy these evils, the National Education Association advocates a simplified curriculum. Commissioner Draper, of New York State, declares that school

records prove the necessity for industrial and vocational training; others advocate promotion by subject and flexible grading. The children have been in school; they have been counted; yet school reports throw very little light upon the subject. The ten largest cities give 324 different facts; only one attempts to give reasons for dropping out. A few reports try to explain why children drop out of one or more grades of high school; but why children drop out of elementary grades, why they never go into the fifth, sixth, or seventh grade, or into high school, we can not learn. While many superintendents are ready to condemn the present curriculum and to adopt changes, their reports give no fact basis to justify remedies because present deficiencies are neither diagnosed nor proved. The superintendent of Birmingham records with surprize that the introduction of manual training does not seem to have stopt school mortality. The records of New York, not applied to this particular problem, show that high schools where commercial and industrial training are given, do not keep their pupils better than other schools having classical training. When the Detroit superintendent talks of first-year pupils dropping out, he says: "Twenty-five because of illness; four because of illness in the family; two because of failing sight; forty-one because of work; six transferred; ten left the city; nine were indifferent to school; one took up music; for twenty-three, causes unknown." Yonkers has a table that shows the number who entered, the number left, the number completing eight terms of work or more, and the number completing from none to seven terms' work. The latest statement of the New York superintendent on this subject is in the report for 1906, and contains no facts but depends upon *undoubtedly, probably, generally, approximately, in my judgment, a few.*

Speaking of school mortality, several cities present facts relative to the mortality of school children. Allegheny gives by districts the number of pupils who died during the year; Cincinnati, the name, age, and cause of death; Columbus, the number of causes and deaths by months; Trenton, the number of deaths, causes, and ages by schools. There is reason to

question the accuracy and completeness of these reports. No one knows how much of the gap between average membership and total net membership is due to sickness or to death. Ought the relation between school and pupil be such that a child can die and be marked as an absentee or be sick and marked as a truant, or that preventable diseases can tax school funds by hundreds of thousands of dollars annually without the schools themselves notifying their communities of such cost?

Truancy and absence furnish illustration of all the strong and weak points of school reporting. New York leads with 260 facts, more than three times the number given by any other school, altho the first ten cities give 505 facts. Even these fail to answer many important questions. A few of thirty new facts reported for New York by Associate Superintendent E. B. Shallow throw light upon the possibility of strengthening reports: Number of cases of truancy reinvestigated, 5,867; number returned to school, 12,755; number due to neglect of parents, 2,771; number of cases of non-attendance due to indifference of parents, to poverty, to sickness, to temporary necessity; number of children placed on probation by district superintendents after hearing of charges of truancy or incorrigibility; number of both classes who improve under probation; number of parents fined, 161; parents imprisoned, 33; number placed on probation by children's court; suspended incorrigibles. Springfield gives by schools the individual truants, the number of truants, the days of truancy, the prosecutions of habitual truants, the number committed to truancy schools and cases pending. Springfield and New Haven give half-days of truancy. Providence gives ages of truants and results of prosecutions. One can not learn for the different cities when the truant officer is notified that the child needs attention, or in how many cases the name is dropped from the list because "an undesirable citizen." Kansas City distinguishes temporary absentees and cases having from one to nine investigations, giving, also, by schools, the number of cases and investigations. The New York report states that part-time pupils are inclined to play truant, a fact fre-

quently urged against the Denver system of the shorter day; yet in 1906-1907 part-time pupils, constituting more than 14 per cent. of the average enrollment for elementary schools, furnish but 12.7 per cent. of the truants.

Why is it that school reports are still so unsatisfactory? Because we have not expected enough from them; secondly, because it has been made no one's business to keep alive between conventions and between articles the interest there exprest,—to applaud the efficient and segregate the backward. When committees were appointed, they worked at odd times without funds for collecting evidence or circulating conclusions. National commissioners and state commissioners have been content to publish reports that they knew were lacking in uniformity, completeness, and accuracy. More important, however, are reasons inherent in the mental attitude of educators which account for the delay in securing action where there has been nominal agreement: (1) They have urged each other to prepare statements for the sake of fellow educators; (2) they have talked too much of uniformity and too little of accuracy, completeness, and significance—uniformity of defects can never help; (3) they have not seen that they can not get proper reports unless they employ records to tell currently their story; (4) they have not wanted to test their own efficiency or the soundness of their methods.

Chief of these reasons for inadequate reporting is the last. What one can learn from one's colleagues is relatively little compared with what one can learn from oneself by applying efficiency tests and asking one's community to apply such tests. The gap between what one tries and what one does is more important than the gap between one's own attempt and another's attempt. Success in modern business depends upon self-analysis, as well as upon study of others. The first reason for school reports is to learn whether the reporter himself is measuring up to the requirements and opportunities of his office. The measurer should be the public, for whose intelligence regarding school policy and school facts too little concern has been shown. What hope is there for democracy if its emblem, the public school, is not managed on democratic

lines? If the public is to administer its own schools, it must be given current knowledge of results, including failures. Citizen judgment can never be based upon intelligence so long as every question is treated with contempt and regarded as reactionary criticism of free education, or so long as taxpayers are expected to "stand and deliver," and blindly to accept as sound any and every plan for spending school money and school energy.

If citizen interest and intelligence are necessary; if the sacredness of the teaching profession is due to its product, not its field; if there is a limit to money required by schools; if the public may be led to cöoperate by information, as well as by cajolery or intrigue; if the title "trustee" does not at once enable citizen directors to sense school needs and school results that as taxpayers they are unable to see; if admission of error will promote education, the potential value of school reports is inestimable. If, fifty years ago, it had been suggested that, in absence of proof to the contrary, teachers and superintendents might be sailing under false colors, besides adding to local taxes and their own labors, it is hardly likely that progress in school administration would have been so tardy. If, for ten years, taxpayers had been told by educators that they should look for proof, they would have forced, long ago, the reforms that educators are unanimous in desiring.

William H. Allen

Secretary of the Bureau of Municipal Research
New York

QUESTIONS ANSWERED

BY

SCHOOL REPORTS AS THEY ARE

SUBMITTED TO THE

CONFERENCE OF STATE SUPERINTENDENTS

CHICAGO, FEB. 22, 1909

"What are the next steps to be taken in the direction of desirable uniformity in the reports of city school statistics called for by state and national offices of education?"

BASED UPON ANALYSIS OF 72 CITY REPORTS

BY THE

BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH

261 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY

IMPORTANT TERMS

WHOSE USE AND MEANING ARE NOT UNIFORM

School age: Pending uniform state requirements, is it practicable for all reports to distinguish the following age groups—4, 5-6, 7-13, 14, 15, 16-17, 18-21? Is it desirable to give census for each age?

Population of city: Since only a few cities have actual counts oftener than once in ten years, should reports indicate whether total population and school population are counts or estimates?

Net: If supposed to include no pupil more than once, is it practicable and desirable for reports to indicate whether and what steps are taken to secure accurate net figures?

Attendance: Should those who attend not more than one—or five, or ten—sessions figure in attendance and in net enrollment? Should legal or special holidays be counted as school days? Are any counted as present on holidays, who were not present the day—or the week—before?

Enrollment, Registration, Membership: Should **register** mean to record a child's intention to attend? Should one who registers but fails to attend be **enrolled** or counted as a **member**? Is there a minimum of attendances that should be required before one may be said to be a **member** or to **belong**? Is it practicable to distinguish between those **admitted** or **entered** and those **belonging**? Should reports indicate when pupils once enrolled are dropped from the list of members on which attendance is computed? Are those present but one half-day counted the same as those present two half-days? Is average attendance based on average—or total—number enrolled—or registered? Is it worth while for a few years to report proportion of actual attendances to both total and net registration and to total, net and average enrollment?

Truants, Absentees, Non-attendants: Should these terms be defined in all reports? Should those who are dropped from the roll because of irregular attendance or chronic absence be reported as truant and absent and thus affect average attendance? Should a distinction be made between those dying and others withdrawn from school?

Cases of vs **Individuals:** Are truants, absentees, the tardy, counted more than once?

Arrested, Apprehended, Brought before Court: Is it desirable to report the different steps of truancy and non-attendance work?

Normal age, Backward: Should reports indicate by years those in each grade and explain what years "normal" covers for each grade?

Medical Inspection, Examination, Follow up work, Treatment: Unless these terms are defined communities having but a perfunctory "looking over" for obvious contagion may be led to believe that their childrens' physical defects are discovered and treated and their school environment supervised by physicians.

Manual, Industrial, Vocational, Trade, Domestic, Commercial: Growing popular and professional interest will increase the evil results of misusing these terms

Cost: Does it, wherever mentioned, include all labor, and all material used for the purpose and period described, whether bills therefor were paid last year, are already paid this year, or still owing? Or does it include only cash payments charged during the period reported to the purpose described? Where one branch or division or purpose is charged with expenses incurred for another, should this fact be clearly stated? Where outlays for permanent improvements are included in current expenses, should the fact be stated?

Percapita: Is it based upon totals or net figures—for enrollment or registration or attendance?

KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS

a	= by	age	also	
bp	= "	birth place	"	
cl	= "	class	"	
co	= "	color	"	
da	= "	days	"	
de	= "	department	"	
dt	= "	district	"	(geographical division)
gr	= "	grade	"	
hs	= "	high school	"	
kd	= "	kind of school	"	
mo	= "	month	"	
na	= "	nationality	"	
qr	= "	quarter	"	
rm	= "	room	"	
sc	= "	school	"	
sx	= "	sex	"	
tr	= "	term	"	
wk	= "	week	"	
yr	= "	year	"	
+	= "	increase or decrease		
%	= "	percentage		
( )	= "	subdivision of preceding item		

ILLUSTRATION

Registration—sx (sc (a, gr), gr (a)) means that the following facts are given: (1) the total registration for all schools; (2) the total of each sex registered; (3) the sex registration in each school; (4) the ages of each sex in each school; (5) the number of each sex in each grade of each school; (6) the sex registration in each grade; (7) the sex registration of each age in each grade

QUESTION

For which main divisions of significant school facts is it desirable or practicable to report any—or all—of the above subdivisions?

Questions Answered by One or More of 72 Reports Regarding

PROMOTION AND SCHOOL MORTALITY

All Schools

Promoted—sx, %; ahead of normal grade; withdrawn, **sx**

Progress and survival—% (charts for 1896-1906, 1897-1907); completing elementary school course or its equivalent; beginning grammar school course who later entered hs; beginning grammar school course who completed a three years course in hs; beginning grammar school course who completed a four years course in hs; elementary school graduates or equivalent who entered hs; beginning a hs course who completed a three years hs course; beginning a hs course who completed a four years hs course

All Elementary Schools

Promoted or advanced—dt, tr (dt), gr (dt, tr (dt)), sc (gr); per cent, **dt, tr, gr (dt, tr (dt));** midyear promotions, **dt, tr (dt);** time occupied in accomplishing grade work; by periods of time; by groups (by periods of time)

Not promoted or advanced—sc, gr (sx)

Normal age—gr; above normal age, **gr;** % above normal age, **yr, gr (yr);** behind grade; %

Pupils withdrawn—sx, to other public schools of city; of state; to private schools; to other schools, **tr,** % **(tr);** leaving to go to work; because of illness, **tr,** % **(tr);** for other reasons; pupils registered last year who are not on register this year; removed from city; removed to other districts of city; gone to other than public schools; sick or visiting; gone to work; unaccounted for above

Suspensions or expulsions—sc, tr, yr, % **(sx, tr, yr)**

Graduates—yr (dt), sc (sx), sx (dt, yr (dt)), a (dt); normal age; above normal age; average age, **dt, sx (dt);** admitted to high school, **sc**

Kindergartens

Promoted to elementary school—sx, sc (sx); % based on average daily membership, **yr**

Withdrawn—sx, sc (sx), tr, % **(tr)**

Primary and Grammar Departments

Promoted—sx, gr (sx); % of promotion on average daily attendance; ahead of normal grade; behind normal grade

Foreign Classes

Promoted to grades—**gr**

Special Classes

Promoted—rm, %; disposition of those promoted; **withdrawn, sx**

Evening Schools

Certification—sx, sc (sx, yr, subject (yr)); withdrawn, sc (sx)

High School

Entitled to enter from public school—**sx, sc (sx), yr, +**

Admitted from all schools—**tr, hs (tr), sx (sc)**; average age, **sc**; from public schools; from other schools or other sources, **tr, hs (tr), sx (tr, sc (tr))**; elementary graduates entering, **dt, %**; from public schools; from other schools; ahead of normal grade; behind

Discharged—before graduation, **yr, sc (yr, sx), gr (yr, sc (yr)), % (yr, sc (yr))**; withdrawn, **sx**; during year and not re-entering

Promoted or advanced—sx, sc, gr (sc, sx), % (sc (dt)); % based on average daily membership, **yr**; not promoted or advanced, **gr, sc (gr)**; certified, **sx (dt, sc (dt)), + (yr)**; average age, **dt, sx (dt)**

Graduated—yr, + (yr, sx), de (yr), sx (dt, yr), sc (sx (dt)), tr (sc, sx (sc)); courses, **sc, tr, sx (sc, tr)**; ratio, **sx, yr; % (sc)**; **average age, dt, sx (dt)**

Entering higher institutions—yr, kind of institution **(yr)**; from last graduating class, **sx, sc (sx)**, kind of institution **(sx, sc (sx))**

Colored High Schools

Admitted from grammar schools—**tr (yr)**; from other schools, **tr (yr)**; by promotion during year, **tr (sx)**; **discharged, yr (%)**; **graduated, sx, de**

Normal Schools

Applicants from city high schools—**sc, tr**; from outside schools, **dt, tr (dt)**; **admitted** from city high schools, **sx, sc (tr), % (sc)**; from outside schools, **dt, tr (dt), % (dt)**; average age, **sc**; **promoted**; % based on average daily membership, **yr, sc**; **withdrawn**; **graduated, sc, tr (sc (yr))**; since organization, **sc**

Questions Answered by One or More of 72 Reports Regarding

MEDICAL SUPERVISION

Purposes—inspection to discover communicable diseases; exclusion of notifiable diseases; treatment of minor diseases; examination of children at request of teachers; examination of all children for physical or mental defects; supervision of play, physical training, buildings

Authorities responsible—board of health; board of education; volunteer agency co-operating with schools

Staff—inspectors, term of service; physicians, **co**, paid, unpaid; time given to work; nurses, paid, unpaid; under health board; under school board; under both

Schools—inspected; not inspected

Children examined—**dt, sc, kd, gr, cl, mo**; after four days consecutive absence; defects found; cases of disease found; by school nurses; for special or ungraded classes or schools, **sx (dt), sc (dt, sx), dt**; sent to classes, **dt, sc (dt)**; reported **dt, sc (dt)**; not reported; backward examined by teachers

Treatment—excluded, **yr, mo, sc**; for each disease; needing treatment, **yr**; receiving treatment, **mo, sc (mo)**; for each disease, %, **yr**, and defect, %, **yr**; not receiving treatment; cured; for each disease; treated at home, **mo**, for each disease; treated by nurse, for each defect, for each disease, **mo**; treated by family physician; by oculist; treated at hospital or dispensary; cured and returned; still under treatment

Notifications—to schools; to parents by mail; by messenger

Aid—**sc**; by volunteer agencies; eye glasses; other relief

Visits—to schools, **mo, sc**; to homes, **mo**; by nurses

Scholarship—no. backward

Questions Answered by One or More of 72 Reports Regarding

PHYSICAL DEFECTIVES

Crippled—enrolled, **sx, mo**; average, **mo**; average membership, **yr**; average attendance, **yr, % (yr)**; **epileptics**; **blind**; **enrolled, sx**; average membership, **sx**; average attendance, **sx**; withdrawn, **sx**; remaining, **sx**; average absence, **sx**; **deaf**; enrolled, **yr**; net, **yr**; average, **yr, na, bp**; registration, **gr (sx, average age), a, sx**; average, **sx, yr**; entered, **sx**; number at date; average attendance, **yr, sx**; **% yr**; not absent, %; for certain period, %; av. absence, **sx**; not tardy, **sx**; persistent attendance, %; received from other buildings; remaining; average per teacher

Questions Answered by One or More of 72 Reports Regarding

MENTAL DEFECTIVES

Registration—**dt, yr, tr (dt), cl (dt)**; average, **rm**; by groups; needing enrollment, **co, sx**; **enrolled, yr, dt, rm, sx, cl, sc (sx, rm)**; received from other schools, **sx**; **average daily attendance, %**; **disposition**; returned to regular schools, **rm**; found in regular schools unable to complete grade; sent to institutions; discharged from school; going to work; withdrawn because unprogressive; leaving; remaining; **progress,** no. at different rates; **residence,** income classes; **physical size,** degree of backwardness

Questions Answered By One Or More of 72 Reports Regarding

TRUANCY AND COMPULSORY EDUCATION

Definition of absence, of truancy

Truant officers by each appointing body

Cases reported—(all, **sx,** truancy, absence, non-attendance, **mo,**); incorrectly; verified; by principals, **dt;** census, **dt;** citizens, **dt;** police, **dt;** from other public schools; incorrigible

Cases investigated—**a, dt, mo;** reinvestigated, **dt;** absence, **dt;** from public,**dt;** parochial, **dt;** other schools, **dt;** on officer's initiative, **dt;** reinvestigated, **dt;** supposed truancy, **dt;** non-attendance, **dt;** complaints, **dt;** reinvestigated; cases excused, % **(sc)**; + (%)

Family relations (truants, non-attendants, both)—; father living mother living; step father; step mother; father intemperate; orphans

Disorderly children—violating rules, **mo;** warned for incorrigibility, **mo;** damaging school property, **dt;** mutilating or losing school books, **dt;** juvenile offenders investigated

Truancy—individuals reported, **sx;** persons warned, **mo;** cases, **dt, sc, tr, yr, mo,** +; individuals, **sx, dt;** days, **dt, sc;** half-days, **dt, sc, tr, yr;** pupils behind grade, due to, **gr, co;** pupils returned, **dt, sx, mo;** to private, parochial and public schools, no. times, **dt;** by attendance officers; from grades without manual training; not located; left city; unenrolled found; % truancy on attendance

Absences—children reported, **sc, mo;** absentees, **mo;** without permission, **sc, mo;** cases acted upon; cases of irregular attendance looked after by attendance officer; non-enrolled; non-attendants placed in school, %, **dt, sx, mo;** children found on streets; returned to school, **sc, mo;** children 14 at work; different children registered in office of district superintendent, **yr;** full time classes, **yr;** part time

classes, yr; special classes, yr; ungraded classes, yr; working legally, sx, dt; neither at work nor in school, a, dt, yr, +; working in stores or shops, yr, dt, +; cannot locate, dt, sx; left city

Illegally employed—found by police, sx; investigated by attendance officers; legally employed, sx; placed in school, yr, sx, dt; regularly attending school, sx; over age, sx; under age, sx; will obtain employment certificates; physically unable to attend, sx; not found or moved, sx; incorrectly reported, sx; cases not yet closed, sx; over 14 working for parents, sx

Kept at home illegally—reported by police, sx; investigated by attendance officers; placed in school, sx; legally employed at home, sx; elsewhere, sx; physically unable to attend, sx; temporarily ill, sx; regularly attending school, sx; not found or moved, sx; under age, sx; cases not yet closed, sx; committed to institutions, sx; placed in private school, sx; mentally defective, sx; will obtain employment certificate, sx; on road with theatrical company, sx; other causes, sx; minding house, dt, yr, +

Causes of truancy and non-attendance (each class and total), cases due to—indifference of parents, sx; sickness, sx, dt; poverty, sx, dt; temporary necessity, sx, dt; lack of clothing; contagious disease; parental neglect, sx, dt, yr; mother obliged to work; mentally or physically disqualified, sx, dt; out late at night; questionable home; total over 16 years

Visits by attendance officers—to homes of non-attendants, yr; to homes of truants, yr; homes visited twice, mo; homes visited three times, mo; to schools, dt, yr, mo; to stores and factories, yr; to courts, yr; miscellaneous, yr

Notices, warnings, etc., sent, mo—to parents for truancy; for non-attendance; served on children; on employers; compulsory notices; interview with parents at office; pupils involved; parents or guardians warned, notified or written to, sx, mo

Treatment of truancy cases by superintendent—summoned for hearing, yr; attending; failing to attend; heard on charges, yr; placed on probation; transferred to other schools, yr; improving under probation and transfer; disregarding probation and recommended for commitment, yr; committed to truant schools; parents refusing to sign commitment papers, yr

Treatment of incorrigibles by superintendent—on charges, yr; placed on probation; transferred to other schools, yr; improving under probation and transfer; disregarding probation and recommended for suspension and commitment, yr; parents refusing to sign commitment papers, yr

Action by courts, juvenile-police-magistrate — children taken to, dt, sx, yr; on charge of truancy, sx; of incorrigibility, sx; of

delinquency; of neglect; cases committed, yr; persons in parental relation arrested, yr; fined, yr, mo; imprisoned, yr; prosecuted, mo; other persons, yr, firms, yr, or corporations, yr, violating compulsory education law; persons prosecuted for selling cigarettes to school children, dt; for allowing school children in pool rooms, dt; persons arrested on warrants, sx; cases disposed of; prosecutions, sx, dt; of persons over 16; of boys; convictions, sx, dt; cases pending, sx; cases dismissed of truancy; of non-attendance; commitments; truants committed, yr (when first arraigned, sx); with parents' consent, dt, sx; after probation, sx; to other institutions, sx; truants transferred to other school; non-attendants committed to truant schools, dt, sx; with parents' consent, dt, sx; transferred to another school; to other institutions; suspended incorrigibles placed on probation, mo; committed to truant school, yr, sx, mo; twice; three times; to other institutions, yr, sx, mo; to private homes; to parents or relatives; total children placed on probation, yr, sx; total transferred; total children arrested and parents notified, dt, mo, sx; more than once; special cases; parent cases

Treatment of truancy cases by truant schools, parental, or special schools for truants—enrollment, sx; registration, tr, yr, +, gr (sx (a)), na, bp; church affiliation; use of tobacco; average, yr, gr; including temporary withdrawals; since admitted; admitted by transfer, gr; attendance, average, tr, yr, gr, +, %, largest number at any one time; no. of sessions; average age; committed; placed on probation, yr, mo (sx); satisfactory, sx; parolled, yr; respected parole, yr; violated parole and returned, yr; days detained; maximum; minimum; **discharged,** with work certificate; without work certificate; to public school; left city; as vagrant; committed to other institutions; by court, through police; through parent; through school; to other truant school; to hospital or other institution for treatment; death; **ready to return** to regular school; to go to work with certificate; without certificate; cured of truancy; of incorrigibility; **improving steadily;** spasmodically; not improving

Questions Answered by One or More of 72 Reports Regarding

WORKING PAPERS, WORK CERTIFICATES, ETC

Certificates issued—age and school, yr (na), gr; work, mo, sx, gr (sx); from public school, gr (sx, mo); other schools, gr (sx, mo); schools outside city, gr (sx, mo); public school below 6th grade, gr (sx, mo); approved, mo; refused, mo, sx; revoked

Exemptions—a, yr, gr; on grounds of poverty, mo; graduates; full orphans; father dead; mother dead; parents separated; divorced;

average term (weeks) of exemption; weeks for which exemptions were granted; affidavits to establish age of children

Aid—applications for scholarship aid; recommended as worthy; recommended to remain at work; required to remain at school; not located; aided; from public school; from private or parochial school; applications for free text books investigated

Newsboys—registered

Questions Answered by One or More of 72 Reports Regarding

POPULATION AND ATTENDANCE

All Schools

Population—**yr, dt**; school census; % in public schools, **dt**; % school age to population

School age—**sx, co (sx)**; in census, **co (dt), sx, dt (sx)**; compulsory; in census, **a**; in school, **a**; not in public school; in other schools; physically unable to attend, %; between 10 and 18 who cannot read or write English, **sx**; who cannot read or write any language, **sx**; between 4 and 18, **a, sc, sx (sc)**; between 9 and 15, **yr**; average age of those not in school, **sx (dt)**

Sittings—**dt, yr**; deficiency or excess, **dt**

Enrollment—**mo (yr), yr, dt (mo (yr)), sx, a** (%, +, **sx, yr**), + (**yr**, % (**yr**), between 9 and 15 (%)), **na**; excluding transfers; re-enrollment, **yr**; **net, yr (dt**, + (**dt, yr**, % (**dt, yr**))); average, **yr, dt (yr)**; %; **a (yr**, between 9 and 15 (**yr**)); new pupils, **tr**; from other districts; outside city; other than public schools; same school district; entered, **sx, a (sx)**; remaining, **sx**

Registration—**na, bp, co, sx (yr, dt (yr), gr (sc)), yr (gr), a**, + (%), **gr (tr), sc (sx), gr (yr)**; including temporary withdrawals, **yr**, +; at end of year, **a, yr**; %, **sx, tr**, on enumeration, **yr**; net, **tr**; average, **yr** (+ (**dt**, % (**dt**)), **dt, sx** (%, **dt**), + (%); for given no. of yrs; % on enrollment, **yr**; average monthly, **sc**; admitted by transfer, **sx**; from city schools; state; private; other states or countries; transfered, **sx**; nationalities with greatest representation; **part-time**, % (**dt**); average per teacher

Attendance—**sx (dt), age-groups (sx), a (gr, sx (dt)**, %), average age (**sx, gr**), **gr**; other than public schools, **sx, age-groups (sx)**; church schools, **sx (dt)**; private, **sx (dt)**; not in school, **sx (dt)**; % on registration, **sx, yr, tr**; % on average registration, yr; % on average monthly presence; average, **yr (dt (sx), mo; mo**, + (**yr, dt (sx)**, % (**yr, dt (sx)**)); average rate for no. of yrs; % on actual no.

days school was in session, tr (gr), dt, sx; occupation; regularity of, yr (dt), %; varying degrees of, %; average monthly, sc, sx, mo; persistent, by 20 da. groups, by ½ da. per week; days present, sc; average per teacher; % on no. of days sc. was in session, yr

Part-time attendance—sc, yr (dt), + (dt, % (dt))

Absence—average, sx; not absent, yr, sx; ½ da, sx, %; varying degrees of, %; legally under 8; legally under 14; deaf, sx; crippled, sx; dumb, sx; blind, sx; mentally defective, sx; teachers, sc, ½ da, yr

Tardiness—pupils, yr, +; not tardy, ½ da (sx), yr; teachers, sc, time lost

Kindergartens

Enrollment—mo (yr), sc, sx (sc), yr; average monthly, yr, % (yr); registration, yr (sx), sx, tr (gr, sx (gr), sc), sc, dt (sx), a (yr, dt, sx (gr, yr)), qr (sc, yr); at close of yr (sc, yr); %, tr (gr, sx (gr)); average, dt, % (dt), yr, + (%), sx (%), sc, groups; average monthly, sx, dt (sx); average per teacher, yr, +, %, gr, dt

Attendance—average, sx, dt (sx), tr (gr, sc), yr, mo (yr), dt (sx), sc; % (tr (gr), dt, sc); average per teacher, gr

Absence—average, dt

Colored Kindergarten

Enrollment—sc, sx (sc), yr; membership, qr (sc, yr); close of yr, sc, yr; average, yr, sc; attendance, average, yr, sc, % (sc)

All Elementary Schools

Enrollment—sx, sc (groups, sx, gr), gr, groups, yr, +, subject (sc), de (gr, sc), na, bp (sc); excluding transfers, sc; counted only once, sc; entered, sx (a, sc); above normal age, gr, % (gr, yr); transfers, sc, sx (sc)

Registration—sc (dt), sx (sc (a, gr), gr), dt, gr (sx, dt), cl (sx (a)), yr, +, tr (sc (gr), gr), a (sx, gr (dt, sx), sc); including temporary withdrawals, groups (sc), sc (yr); groups (sc, sx, gr (sx (a))); at end of yr (sc, sx (sc, gr (sc))); net, tr (sc); average, dt, yr, + (yr, dt, %), sx (%, sc), sc (groups), groups, % (dt)

Attendance—average, sc, dt (sc), tr (sc (gr), gr), sx (sc), yr, +, gr (sc), groups (sc), % (sc, groups (sc)); persistency, ½ da. absences, sc, % (sc)

Absence—average, sc; various degrees (sc, % (sc)); average per teacher, yr (+, %), sc (a, sx); remaining, sc, sx (sc), gr (sc)

Tardiness—yr; not tardy, sc; not absent, sc

Colored Elementary Schools

Enrollment—sx, yr, +, na, sc; including transfers, sc; entered, sx (sc); transfered, sc, sx (sc); registration, sc, sx (sc (a, gr)); including temporary withdrawals, sc; at end of yr, sc, sx (sc, gr (sc)); average (sc); attendance, average, sc, % (sc); average per teacher, sc; persistency by ½ da. absences, sc; not absent, sc; tardiness, yr; not tardy, sc

Primary Department

Enrollment—sx, % (yr); average monthly, yr, dt (yr); registration, tr, sx (gr), sc (gr), gr (cl (yr)), yr, + (yr (gr)), % (tr (sx (gr))); average, gr (yr); average a (sc (gr)); a (sx (gr)); average per teacher, gr; attendance, average, tr (gr), yr, dt (yr), gr, % (tr (gr)); average per teacher, gr

Grammar Department

Enrollment—sx, % (yr); average monthly, yr, dt (yr); registration, tr, sx (gr), sc (gr), qr (cl (yr)), yr, + (yr (qr)), % (tr (sx (gr))); average, gr (yr); average age, sc (gr); average per teacher, gr; new pupils, tr, % (tr); transferred, tr; to public, tr, % (tr); net registration, tr, % (tr); never before attended, tr, % (tr); registered this term and last also, tr, % (tr)

Attendance—average, tr (gr), yr, dt (yr), gr, % (tr (gr)); average per teacher, gr, a, sx (gr); transfers, from public schools, tr, % (tr)

All High, Normal and Latin Schools

Enrollment—yr (dt, sc, a (sx)), sx (yr (gr), cl), sc (sx (gr, cl,), gr (sx, sc, yr), a (sx, sc (sx)), tr, na (sc), de (gr, sc), + (cl (sx (yr))), % (yr), % of boys (yr), % of + (dt); % on average membership, yr; subject, cl, sc (cl); net, sc, yr; average, yr

Registration—yr (sx, +, dt), tr (gr, sx (gr)), + (sx, yr), sc (sx, dt), a (sx, gr (sx), yr), qr (yr, cl (yr)), sx, na, bp; % on number admitted, yr; % of boys; including temporary withdrawals, sx, yr, sc (yr); excluding transfers, sc, sx (sc); net, tr, sx, sc (sx); %, tr (gr, sx (gr)); average, dt, yr (+ (%)), sx (%), sc (yr, +, sx, gr), gr (yr), mo, % (dt); average per teacher, gr, yr, sc, tr

Attendance—average, sc (sx), sx, tr (gr), yr (+), gr (sc), mo; occupation; % boys; % (sc, tr (gr), gr (sc), mo, yr); attending during year; persistency, by ½ da. absences (sc, % (sc), yr); remaining at end of year, sx (yr, gr), sc (sx), gr (sc), qr, yr, cl (yr), + (qr, yr); entered, sc, sx (sc), tr (sx, sc); finishing first year, sx, sc;

received by transfer, sc, sx (sc); transferred to other schools, sx, sc (sx); new pupils, sx; re-admitted, yr; average age, sc, gr, sx (gr), over 18 (sx, sc); average per teacher, gr, tr, sc; absence, average, sx, sc (sx); varying degrees of, %; not absent, sc, yr; varying degrees of non-absence

Tardiness—pupils, yr, % (yr); cases of tardiness, yr; not tardy, sc

Colored High Schools

Enrollment—yr, sx (a), subject (cl), sx (cl), sc (sx (cl)), na (sc), + (yr), % (yr); registration, + (yr), sc (sx), a (yr), qr (yr, cl (yr)), sx, % (yr); average, yr, sc, mo; including temporary withdrawals, sx, yr; excluding transfers, sc, sx (sc); net, sx, sc (sx); attendance, average, sx, + (yr), mo, % (sc, mo, yr); persistency, by ½ da. absences (sc); remaining at end of year, sx (yr, gr), qr, yr, cl (yr), + (qr, yr); entered, sc, sx (sc); received by transfer, sc, sx (sc); transfered to other schools, sx, sc (sx); new pupils, sx; readmitted, yr; average per teacher, sc; not absent, sc, yr; tardy, yr, % (yr); cases of tardiness, yr; not tardy, sc

Training and Normal Schools

Enrollment—tr (yr), sc, sx, gr, +, bp, na, de (tr); end of year, sx (gr); net, sc, average

Registration—dt, sc, yr, +, tr (gr, sx (gr)), cl, a (sx (gr)), gr, qr (yr), sx (a); excluding transfers, sx; including temporary withdrawals,yr, sc (yr); net, yr, tr, sc; average, yr, + (%), sx (%); %, tr (gr, sx (gr)); received by transfer, sx; transfered to other schools, sx; new pupils; entered, sx; average per teacher, gr

Attendance—average, dt, sc, tr (gr), sx, yr (+); %, yr, tr (gr); average per teacher, gr; absence, average; not absent; cases of tardiness, yr

All Evening Schools

Enrollment—sx, na (sx, bp (sx); English-speaking adults; foreigners learning English, yr (sx), +, sc, a (sc); occupation, sx; net, sx, sc (sx); registration, yr, +; average, yr, +, sc; attendance, average, a (sx, sc (sx)), sx, yr, +, English-speaking adults; foreigners learning English; occupation; % on enrollment of English-speaking adults, yr; of foreigners learning English, sc; average no. evenings attended per pupil, sx; persistency, sx, sc (sx); average per teacher, sc; average age, yr; sessions, sx

Colored Evening Schools

Enrollment—sc; registration, sc; average, sc; attendance, average, sc, % (sc, dt); persistency, sc; average per teacher, sc

Evening Elementary Schools

Enrollment—dt (sx), na (sc, sx), +, co (sc), sc, sx (sc), yr, bp (sc, sx (sc)); registration, yr (dt), + (% (dt), sc), sc; average, dt, yr, sc; attendance, average, dt, sx, sc (sx), de, yr (dt); %, + (dt); English-speaking adults, sc; %, sc; on registration (dt (sc)); on enrollment (sc, dt (sc)); on average register (dt (sc)); average no. evenings attended per pupil, sx, sc (sx); sessions, sc; average per teacher, sc; absence, average, sx

Evening High Schools

Enrollment—dt (sx), +, na (sc (sx)), bp, sc (sx), sx; subject (sc); registration, dt, yr, + (%); subject; residence district; average, dt, yr, sc (sx)

Attendance—average, yr, dt, sx, sc (sx), %; residence district, subject (sc); % on enrollment, dt (sx), sc; % on registration, dt, subject; % on average registration, dt; average no. evenings attended per pupil, sc, sx (sc); remaining at close of year, sc (sx); average per teacher, dt, sc; absence, average, sc (sx); sessions, sc

Evening, Technical, Drawing and Cooking Schools

Enrollment, sc; registration, sc, average, sc, yr; attendance, average, sc, yr, % (sc), + (yr); absence, average; sessions, sc

Trade and Industrial Schools

Enrollment—sc (gr), % (yr), a (de, sx (da)), co, sx (co), de (sx), subject (sc); membership, average, sx, de (sc), co (sx), yr, sc; attendance, average, sx, co (sx), sc, % (sc); average age

Free Lectures, Evening Recreation, Domestic Science and Manual Training Centres

Enrollment—sx, gr, yr (sx), centres (sc), average; membership, gr, sc (gr), average, gr, sc (gr); attendance, aggregate, dt; average daily, sc, dt; average weekly, yr, sx (yr); centres (sc); tardiness, centres (sc); absence, centres (sc)

Special Classes: Non English-speaking, Work-certificate, German, Preparatory, Special Pupils

Enrollment—a, dt (a), sc; language, na, sx; age-groups; registration, tr (gr); net, tr, gr, bp; average, groups, sx; attendance, tr (gr),

+; perfect, sc; average duration; varying degrees of absence, sc; new pupils, tr; rapid progress, a, dt (a)

Vacation Industrial, Manual Training, Kindergarten, Primary, Grammar, Private and Parochial Schools and Playgrounds

Enrollment—dt (sc), sc, sx; on waiting list, sc; registration, average, sc (sx); attendance, aggregate days, dt (sc, kind of playground); average, dt (sc, kind of playground), sx (sc), % (sc, dt); average per teacher, sc

School Baths

Enrollment—da (sc); week (sc); yr (sc); attendance, sx (dt, time of da. (dt)); average weekly

Corporate Schools

Registration, sc

POINTS OF AGREEMENT AS TO UNIFORMITY

School Reports Are Not Now Uniform
- State with state
- City with city
- District with district within a city
- Year with year

Uniformity is Desirable if Practicable
- So far as public schools have common experience
- So far as public schools have common needs

Uniformity Would Benefit
- Administrators
- Teachers
- Pupils
- Taxpayers
- Students of education

There is a Practicable Minimum of Uniformity
- In content
- In form
- In nomenclature

UNSETTLED QUESTIONS AS TO UNIFORMITY

What needs and what experiences are common to all public schools?

What should appear in summaries?

What main divisions are significant?

What subdivisions should be given for each main division?

Where should percentages be used?

What material should be published annually—biennially—not more than once in five years?

What uniform current records are necessary in order to furnish material for minimum uniform reports?

What, if any, material should be omitted from city reports but included in state and national reports?

NOV 9 19[illegible]

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 021 334 696 9

BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEA[illegible]

January 1st, 1906 Organized as "Bureau of City Betterment"
May 3rd, 1907 Incorporated as "Bureau of Municipal Research"

PURPOSES

To promote efficient and economical municipal government; to promote the adoption of scientific methods of accounting and of reporting the details of municipal business, with a view to facilitating the work of public officials; to secure constructive publicity in matters pertaining to municipal problems; to collect, to classify, to analyze, to correlate, to interpret and to publish facts as to the administration of municipal government. (Articles of Incorporation)

PRINCIPAL REPORTS, JANUARY, 1906 to JULY, 1909

1 Some Phases of the Work of the Department of Street Cleaning 30c.

3 *Salary Increases Not Provided for in Budget

5 *The City of New York, the Street Railroad Companies and a Million and a Half Dollars

6 *How Manhattan is Governed

7 Analysis of the Salary Expenditure of the Department of Health of the City of New York for the Year 1906

8 A Department of Municipal Audit and Examination 30c.

9 Making a Municipal Budget; Functional Accounts and Records for the Department of Health 60c.

10 *New York City's Department of Finance

11 The Park Question, Part I, Critical Study and Constructive Suggestions Pertaining to Administrative and Accounting Methods of the Department of Parks: Manhattan, and Richmond $1.10

12 The Park Question, Part II, Critical Study and Constructive Suggestions Pertaining to Revenue and Deposits of the Department of Parks: Manhattan and Richmond 60c.

13 Memorandum of Matters Relating to New York City's Debt that Suggest the Necessity either for Judicial Ruling or for Legislation 30c.

14 *Bureau of Child Hygiene 40c.

15 Questions Answered by School Reports as They Are

16 New York City's Debt: Facts and Law Relating to the Constitutional Limitation of New York's Indebtedness 35c.

17 Collecting Water Revenues: Methods Employed by the Bureau of Water Register, Manhattan, with Suggestions for Reorganization 50c. Digest of same, free on application

18 What Should New York's Next Mayor Do? 10c.

19 School Progress and School Facts 25c.

REPORTS IN PROGRESS, JULY, 1909

Administration of Department of Water Supply, Gas and Electricity

Real Estate Transactions, Department of Finance

Tenement House Administration

Bureau of Supplies and Repairs, Department of Police

Series of Reports: New York as Revenue Producer, as Budget Maker, as Operator of Shops, etc.

* Out of print